

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XX

New York, Wednesday, August 20, 1919

Number 250

Contents

The Week	67
Leading Editorials	
Direct Action and the Plumb Plan	69
To the Railroad Workers	71
Back On Again	72
A Disgrace	73
The Brotherhood Plan, or What?	74
General Articles	
Poland and the Jews	H. N. Brailsford 78
Night (Verse)	Elizabeth J. Coatsworth 81
Notes on French Politics	G. B. Noble 82
The Advertising Man	S. N. Behrman 84
The Cycle of Revolution	Alfred B. Kuttner 86
Some Day I Shall Be. (Verse.)	David Rosenthal 88
At Sunset. (Verse)	Evelyn Wells 88
Correspondence	89
After the Play	C. M. 94
Reviews of Books	
A Great Churchman	H. J. L. 95
Herbert Trench's Poems	L. R. 96
Emerson in French	Ellen Fitzgerald 98
Iron	S. N. B. 100

The Week

ALL the correspondents in Paris report the anger of the Peace Conference at Rumania's action in marching on Budapest. That all of the great Powers are genuinely angry we very much doubt. But upon what grounds do any of them protest if Rumania uses her army to establish a basis for her territorial claims? Rumania did not invent that practice. French troops marched into the Saar a week after the signing of the armistice, and military occupation all along has been the best claim France has had to the Valley. British troops conquered Asia Minor—and have not yet withdrawn, despite the protests of the French. Italy rushed troops to the east shore of the Adriatic when the armistice was signed, and views possession as nine points of the case. Czech troops have marched into Hungary, and Polish troops into Galicia. Is Rumania to be denied because she is weaker than her peers? When the great Powers have set the example they need not protest if the smaller ones accept it.

THE case of Syria is one more instance to show that we are still far from that new international order which gives first place to self-determination. Neither England nor France seems primarily concerned with what the Syrians

think about Syria. France bases her claim on the Sykes-Picot treaty of 1916. But a year earlier there had been a treaty drawn between England, France and Russia for a settlement in Asia Minor. England's present claim seems to be that the collapse of Russian imperialism makes both agreements invalid. This point of law France cannot admit. But England has a better case than that. On her side is the one argument which more than any other wrote the territorial terms of the peace treaty. It was her troops that conquered Asia Minor.

BULGARIA had no reason to expect mercy at the hands of the Allies, and she will get no mercy. The small strip of Mediterranean seacoast which even her implacable Balkan enemies left her after her unconditional surrender in the second Balkan war is to be taken away, part going to the proposed free state of Constantinople, part to Greece. On strict principles of nationality Bulgaria's rights in this territory never were well grounded. In very few of the districts do the Bulgarians represent a majority, or even a plurality. But Bulgaria came into possession of this territory only through the recognition of her Balkan enemies that at least a show of compensation had to be made for the retention by Serbia of the indisputably Bulgarian districts of Macedonia and for the pillage of the Bulgarian Dobrudja by Rumania. The Paris statesmen know how to take away from Bulgaria what perhaps she should not have, but they do not know how to restore to her what is her right. As in most of their other territorial dispositions, the peace makers have worked toward the infliction of a greater injustice than existed heretofore, or would even now be inflicted by Bulgaria's ancient enemies if they could not act with imagined impunity under the sinister shadow of an imperialistic league.

MR. WILSON'S formal comment on Viscount Uchida's statement does not clear the issue in Shantung. For, while contesting one of Japan's claims, the President tacitly admits to full standing another which is of major importance. The point with which Mr. Wilson takes issue is Uchida's inference that the treaty of 1915 is valid. This agreement, by which Japan was further to despoil China, the President refuses to approve. He made that clear to the Japanese delegates in Paris. "Indeed," says Mr. Wilson, "I felt it my duty to say that nothing that I agreed to must be construed as an acquiescence on the part of the

government of the United States in the policy of the notes exchanged between China and Japan in 1915 and 1918, and reference was made in the discussion to the enforcement of the agreements of 1915 and 1918 only in case China failed to cooperate fully in carrying out the policy outlined in the statement of Baron Makino and Viscount Chinda."

UNDER the circumstances, since China must "cooperate fully" in a policy which is only defined in general terms, it will not be strange if Japan again comes forward with a claim that the 1915 and 1918 agreements are valid. But the point which Mr. Wilson entirely ignores is the statement, made in identical words both by Uchida and by his delegates in Paris, that Japan has no intention of surrendering any of the economic privileges in Shantung. Mr. Wilson must know that these privileges, enveloping completely the harbor of Tsingtao, the Kiao-Chau-Tsinanfu railway, and the coal and iron mines, amount to virtual possession of the province—no matter where the flimsy political authority resides. Nevertheless it seems that if the United States is to protest against the handing back of an empty shell to China the initiative must now come from the Senate.

DESPITE Mr. Wilson's use of the cost-of-living issue to push them along toward an indiscriminate ratification of the treaty, the Republican Senators are becoming bolder. In Tuesday's debate Mr. Lodge proposed that any reservations made by the Senate ought to be "accepted by at least the other four of the five principal allied and associated powers before we become members of the League." Mr. Lodge made this proposal informally; but in making it he stood on sound ground. If America makes reservations which are entirely "interpretive" the day may come when, acting on our own interpretation, we are nevertheless accused by our allies of bad faith. If reservations are worth making at all they are worth making definitely. Our associates will accept them. An American guarantee is something they will bid for, despite the fact that of late we have been offering it cheaply.

THAT part of his address to Congress in which Mr. Wilson discusses labor questions has thrown light on a much debated point. On the 20th of May the President spoke to Congress of the industrial organization of America: "We cannot go any farther in our present direction. . . . We must find another [road], leading in another direction and to a very different destination. It must lead not merely to accommodation but also to a genuine cooperation and partnership based upon a real community of interest and participation in control." To many, no doubt, it seemed possible that the President was returning home with a programme based upon his observation of democratic movements in Europe and one that might anticipate in some measure the industrial difficulties in store for America.

EXPECTATIONS of this sort are not encouraged by the address of last Friday. Mr. Wilson discussed the rela-

tions of capital and labor, but not in words that suggest the possession of a definite platform. His analysis of the situation could scarcely have been put in more general terms: "There are many things that ought to be corrected in the relations between capital and labor, in respect of wages and conditions of labor, and *other things* even more far reaching." Nor was his conclusion any less general. Employers and workmen must not continue as antagonists; "They must, on one plan or another, be effectively associated. Have we not steadiness and self-possession and business sense enough to work out that result? Undoubtedly we have, and we shall work it out."

A COMMON disapproval is about all that the New York newspapers share in their comment on the brotherhood plan for control of the railways. When they come to a political interpretation of the plan their unanimity goes to smash. The Times says "it is plainly a venture in radical socialism." But the Call, which is itself socialist, denies that there is any socialism in it and calls it "a sort of compromise syndicalism." The Evening Sun, less of an authority on socialism, agrees with the Call: "it is not even socialistic though it has a streak of socialism in it as an excuse or bait"—it is "essentially a class scheme of a peculiarly definite type." Meantime the World comes out flatly: "The plan of the railroad employees for taking over the railroad properties of the country is a straightout adventure into soviet economics."

ONE point in the testimony of Mr. Glenn E. Plumb before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce has had sensational comment. "Plumb Approves Bolshevik Theory of Public Ownership," says a startling headline in the New York World, and other journals in New York and out of it appear to have made a similar display. The incident which caused the stir was this: Representative Sanders of Indiana read from a document declaring the forests, mines and waterways to be public property, and asked Mr. Plumb if he agreed. Mr. Plumb said he did. Whereupon Mr. Sanders triumphantly remarked: "That is a direct quotation from a photographic copy of the Russian Soviet Government, as furnished by the State Department!" This sort of hide-and-seek, with its sensational publicity, is not a very creditable performance. The Soviet Constitution contains certain principles that Russia has adopted from the United States, and certain others that we should like to see the United States borrow from Russia. For instance, if Mr. Sanders will examine Part V, Chapter XVI, §80, he will find that Russia has a national budget. A little Bolshevism of that sort wouldn't harm our own progressive legislators.

THE Attorney-General faces a double task. He must not only bring criminal action against the packers for alleged violation of the anti-trust law; he must also create an emergency organization of Federal Attorneys and former State Administrators of the Food Administration to take the place of Mr. Hoover's abandoned machine. From neither of these two efforts need we expect early results. Time, and an organizer of Mr. Hoover's ability,

are needed to create a Food Administration. And criminal prosecution of the packers has produced so little in the past that scepticism is pardonable. The most encouraging aspect in the present agitation against the packers is the fact that it has set a Senate Committee at work on the Kenyon bill. This measure is more promising than prosecution, for the reason that it proposes a substitute for the system which it attacks.

AT the end of three days the Brooklyn Rapid Transit strike has ended in a victory for the employees. The single issue involved was recognition of the union. Mr. Garrison, receiver for the B.R.T., still balks at the word "recognition." But if the union can prove that it has enrolled more than fifty per cent of the B.R.T. employees, then Mr. Garrison will "entertain its grievances." With this phrase the employees are content, so long as they have the right to bargain collectively. For three days a great part of New York was put to inconvenience while Mr. Garrison talked of "outside organizers" and declared that the main issue was not between the B.R.T. and its employees, but between the police and "the disorderly element." Too often it is only after the public has paid the price that an employer consents to let his workmen address him through an organization of their own choosing.

LESS serious in its effects than the B.R.T. strike is the closing of half the summer plays on Broadway by the strike of the Actors' Equity Association. A good deal of fun has been poked at the striking actors. Nevertheless they have grievances, which are entirely legitimate. It was hard, for instance, to see why managers should profit from special performances and actors should not. The first demand of the actors, however—like the first demand of the B.R.T. conductors—is for recognition of their union. Because they are not so well organized as the conductors, their chances of success do not seem equally bright. When the steel unions tried to break into the plants at Gary and Homestead they found their weakness lay in the fact that they had never organized the unskilled work. So the actors are finding now, that in future they must build on the lowly chorus.

THE National Guard has always had its own political reasons for opposing a consolidation of military command in the federal government. It is therefore not possible to regard the most recent statement of the National Guard Association as entirely disinterested. Nevertheless the vigor with which the Association attacks Senator Chamberlain's bill for compulsory military training shows that in the ranks of the army men there is to be a real split. The Chamberlain bill, says the National Guard, is "nothing short of conscription under the guise of universal service"; "it creates at enormous expense the machinery for the establishment in America of that detestable Prussian system which is so abhorrent to the American people." It would not be surprising if Senator Chamberlain, Representative Kahn and Secretary Baker found active support for their new plans coming almost exclusively from the ever-ready Defense Societies.

Direct Action and the Plumb Plan

IN response to questions put to them from all sides the organized railroad employees announced on August 9th that "we have no desire, and have had none, to impress upon the public by violence, or by threat, our proposal that the railroads be nationalized under tripartite control." As Mr. Plumb said in his testimony, "this is a question of statesmanship." Does this mean that the public is justified in putting out of mind the thought of a railroad strike? Not at all. Side by side with the constructive proposal of the brotherhoods is the demand for an immediate increase of real wages, this to be accomplished either by reduction of prices or an advance in money wages. The demand is backed frankly by the threat of a strike. But behind both the plan and the demand is something greater than the assurances of any leader. It is the restlessness of the rank and file and in that restlessness is to be found the cause of the sudden and unexpected turn in railroad affairs. The men have forced the pace. They have pushed the leaders further and more quickly than they had planned to go at the present time, and they have made the Plumb plan, destined until a few days ago to be advocated slowly by education, into the central issue of the day. And so, while there is no doubt of the sincerity and essential conservatism of the brotherhood leaders in their promise not to use direct action, it will be the rank and file who will determine the speed with which they move. Unless prices should go down, as no one expects them to, railroad disorders are inevitable as they now stand, and once the men are in a mood to strike no one can tell whether their demands will be confined to wages or whether they will embrace the Plumb plan as well.

In other words, the facts, not the intentions or the theories of the leaders, indicate a very strong tendency toward direct action, and every move by the press and by public officials to weaken the authority of the leaders increases the probability of it. Let us get this into our heads at the outset. The leaders of the brotherhoods are not revolutionists, not socialists. They represent as conservative a leadership as any one now living can hope to find in the labor movement. They are moderate, more averse to violence, more convinced of the desirability of reasoned solutions than the men whom they represent. They have every personal interest in avoiding the terrors of a great transportation strike. To each one of them as individuals a strike would mean personal dangers of an extraordinary kind, and they know more clearly than any one else just what these would be.

We believe they will never be found pushing the men to a strike. It is the men who will push them if relief does not come.

Those who have put the question to them as to whether or not they intend direct action are of two classes and sets of motives. One group, the smaller of the two, is honestly prepared to discuss the plan on its merits, and to move rapidly towards a solution of the problem. It is opposed to direct action as a matter of principle, and believes that the issue can be settled rationally by consent and good will. It is a minority among the politicians and men of influence. The other group is asking the question in order to find out how much attention to pay to the Plumb plan, and the plain fact is that it would pay no attention were it convinced that there were no penalty for ignoring the proposal. It is this group which incites to direct action, and it will be fundamentally responsible if in the end disorder breaks out. The politicians, the business men, and the editors, who will try to exploit the moderation of the brotherhood leaders by shilly-shallying, evading, obstructing, and misrepresenting, are the most dangerous group in America today. The rank and file will judge by results. If the moderate leaders seem to be lost in a bog, unable to achieve anything, they will not permanently follow those leaders. They will resort to direct action, if they come to find that negotiation and education alike are failing.

The obvious conclusion to draw is that the Administration and Congress can avoid an ugly evolution by taking up the brotherhood plan sincerely and directly, dealing with it on its merits, and enacting it after the necessary safeguards of the public interest have been introduced into it. Of all the plans now before Congress, it is in principle the best, and the only one with a fair promise of success. But this conclusion is purely theoretical. The old parties are not prepared for such action; they are not convinced that the Plumb plan is sound; they are terrified at the bogeys it raises. Intellectually and morally they are totally unready for clean and constructive action and unless all the signs are wrong they will attempt one of the more orthodox but basically impossible schemes for dealing with the railroad question. In the meantime no adequate reduction of prices is in sight. Unrelieved pressure upon the wage workers who are already restless, combined with a half-hearted scheme of railroad reorganization, will tend to drive the whole matter from discussion to direct action.

In this will lie the test of the union leaders. Caught between the indifference and obstruction of their opponents and the growing desperation of their followers, they must find a way of making

themselves heard, felt, and respected which does not involve the awful costs of direct action. That way is through independent political action. Their opponents appeal to the principle of majority rule. They can afford to accept the principle and the challenge it implies. If what they want is genuinely in the interest of the masses of America, as we believe it is, they need not fear that test. But in accepting it they will have to recognize that as the parties and as the avenues of publicity are arranged today, they do not have a fair chance to reach that majority which would gladly support them if it understood their aims.

The kind of politics Mr. Gompers has always played with the Democrats is played out. It ends as all the so-called concessions to labor have ended, in frustration. It is class politics in the vicious sense, a mere matter of throwing a bone to "labor" now and then, as bones are thrown by politicians to Negroes, to foreign-born voters, to special interests. So long as the unions stand hat in hand in the lobbies of the politicians, punctuating this servility with strikes and threats, they are a special interest and a poor one at that. They will never be anything more until they acknowledge frankly that they have aims that in the long run are of interest to all voters as men and women, and boldly take the lead by independent political action of their own. Why should they follow discredited politicians? What they propose is as comprehensively national in purpose as any of the empty talk of the ordinary political convention, and a great deal more genuine in purpose, and as somebody has got to take the lead in progressivism, they might as well do it.

But their leadership will be clouded in every kind of misrepresentation unless they realize, and act on the knowledge, that their economic power alone will get them an adequate hearing. The fact that they could strike, not that they will strike, is the thing which will determine the fairness of the hearing they obtain before the voters. It is all very pretty to pretend that they will be fairly heard simply on their merits. They will not be. Their opponents control the bulk of the press, and this control is decisive in the effort to secure majority approval. The unions can neutralize that power by their own latent economic power. They can be heard for the reason that they can insist upon being heard.

In some such way as this their tactics would seem to define themselves: To put transportation, and other basic industries, upon a cooperative basis, independent political action under labor leadership will be required. This action will be founded upon the appeal to the support of the mass by the people. But to prevent that appeal from being cen-

sored and twisted, the latent power of the strike is needed.

No measure like the Plumb plan which involves the whole nation should be enacted under the threat of direct action, and even convinced believers in the plan would have to resist if democratic methods were violated in the attempt to achieve it. But that is not the whole story. The opposition to the plan will, unless it is drastically prevented from doing so, use a direct action of its own fully as undemocratic and vastly more dangerous than any threat to strike. It will use its control of publicity to make an honest democratic appeal impossible. Against this there is no remedy but resistance, no insurance except a clear understanding that if the plan is not discussed on its merits, if the appeal to the majority is blocked, if the average man is bamboozled with propaganda, then the reserve power of the union comes into action.

It is right that the unions should be made to stay within the limits of democratic action. But democracy without freedom of speech is impossible, and freedom of speech in our day is not merely legal freedom, but an equal opportunity to be heard. For that right the threat of the strike may have to be invoked, and the sooner that is understood the less need there will be to invoke it.

To the Railroad Workers

THE railroad brotherhoods' plan of a copartnership of labor and government is a revolutionary one. It runs counter to some deep American prejudices, which it will be by no means easy to overcome. To succeed, the brotherhoods must convince the country that they understand their public responsibilities, and that they have the strength and the self-control to fulfill them.

Above all, the public must be assured that the plan will not be used as a source of unjust profit to a favored class of labor. Such a suspicion will not only confirm and embitter the hostility of the interested opposition, but it will rally against the plan the workers in other fields of industry, whose interests as consumers will be jeopardized, as well as the farmers, who are immediately and vitally interested in cheap transportation. If there are to be excessive profits, it is no doubt better that they should go to labor than to capital. But labor is claiming that its plan will eliminate excessive profits. If it does no more than to substitute labor profiteering for the profiteering of capital, there can be no hope for a political alliance of laborers and farmers, and without such an alliance the plan is politically impossible.

The most effective step the railroad men can take to allay such a suspicion is to so amend their bill as

to take the control of wages out of the hands of the interested employees, and place it in the hands of the government.

The bill as now drafted makes an ingenious attempt to set up an automatic check on improper wage increases. All general wage demands must go before a central Board of Wages and Working Conditions, composed of an equal number of representatives of classified employees, and representatives of officials. A majority vote of this board is conclusive, and a wage increase ordered by such a vote must be put into effect by the Board of Directors. If there is a tie vote, there is an appeal to the directors. All net earnings of the system, after payment of operating expenses and interest and sinking fund requirements, are to be equally divided between the employees and the government, the employees' share being distributed among them in proportion to their respective wages or salaries. But it is provided that the official employees shall receive twice the rate of dividend as do the classified employees. The theory is that this relatively large rate of distribution to the officials will give them a strong incentive to resist any wage increases which might unduly eat into profits.

As a check on undue profits it is provided that if at any time the government's share of the net earnings shall exceed five per cent of the gross revenues, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall adjust freight and passenger rates so as to "absorb the sum so paid as accruing to the Treasury, thereby producing a reduction in rates equivalent to said sum." Expressed in another way, this appears to mean that if net earnings exceed ten per cent of the gross revenue, rates are to be reduced so as to cut down the net earnings to five per cent of the gross revenue.

How this bill will work out in practice can be roughly estimated. Gross revenues of the Class 1 railroads (those with gross revenues over \$1,000,000 a year) composing nine-tenths of the country's railroad mileage, amounted in the calendar year 1918 to \$4,842,695,884. Operating expenses were \$4,123,419,690, leaving an operating income of \$719,274,194. Out of this come the fixed charges and sinking fund payments. The railroads claim a valuation of about \$19,000,000,000, which Mr. Plumb, the railroad employees' counsel, claims he can reduce to \$12,000,000,000. Assume that he is right. The government is now paying 4¾ per cent for money; an additional loan of \$12,000,000,000 will certainly send the rate as high as 5 per cent. The sinking fund requirement is 1 per cent. Six per cent of twelve millions is 720,000,000, or slightly more than the operating income would have been in 1918, leaving nothing for profits.

Obviously we must have an increase in freight rates, to meet wage increases and higher material costs since 1918, and also to leave a fair margin of profit. Assume that rates are raised enough to meet these new expenses, and in addition to bring in an operating income above expenses approximately equal to the average operating income of the three years preceding 1918, namely about \$900,000,000. After meeting interest and sinking fund requirements, there would be about \$180,000,000 net earnings, of which one-half or \$90,000,000 would be available for distribution among the employees. Estimates recently submitted by the Railroad Administration to the Senate showed a payroll in 1918 of \$2,593,000,000. No figures have been published showing exactly what portion of the 1918 payroll represented officers' salaries and what part wages of classified employees. But we know that on January 1, 1919, there were 1,843,530 employees and that of these only 19,349 were officers. And we know from reports to the Interstate Commerce Commission that in the previous year 18,601 officers had received \$58,327,493 in salaries. We can safely assume that the pay roll for officers in 1918 was not over \$61,000,000. In order to allow for the double dividend to officials, we add this \$61,000,000 to the total pay-roll, and get \$2,654,000,000. Of this sum the dividend of \$90,000,000 is under 3.5 per cent. In other words each employee would receive a dividend of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of his annual wage, and each official a dividend of seven per cent of his annual salary.

Obviously if the classified employees ask for a wage increase of 10 per cent, or even 8 per cent, and offer the same increase to the officials, it will be to the pecuniary advantage of the officials to forego the dividends and vote for the wage increase. Even if the employees, by greater efficiency, are able to bring their share of net earnings up to the limit of 5 per cent of the gross earnings, they would have for distribution only about \$240,000,000, or approximately 9 per cent for the classified employees and 18 per cent for the officials. A flat increase of 20 per cent or over would be sufficient to win the support of the officials.

These calculations are necessarily on a basis of past years, since the revenues and expenses of the future are problematical. It is possible that the future may bring larger gross revenues than 1918, and hence larger dividends for the employees under the brotherhoods' plan. But 1918 was a year of unprecedented revenues, because of the huge war shipments. Increased freight rates will tend to increase revenues, but for some years at least decreased traffic may tend to reduce them. And the pay roll for the future will be much larger, owing to wage increases since 1918, thus reducing the rate

of dividend by increasing the sum upon which the net earnings are apportioned. Twenty per cent is probably the outside limit which official dividends could attain. The wage increase demanded by the railway shopmen at present is twenty-five per cent.

It is doubtful whether any automatic check on wages is possible. A check that is effective probably cannot be devised and if it can, it is as likely to keep wages too low as it is to prevent their going too high. Wages will always be largely a matter of compromise, of comparison with wages in other industries, of revision as the cost of living changes. And with as large and as important a group as the railroad employees, responsibility for wages must be with the government. The principle of bi-partisan adjustment boards is a valuable one, as the experience of the Railroad Administration during the war has demonstrated. Mr. McAdoo's annual report pays them a high tribute. But Mr. McAdoo, as the government's representative, always retained the authority to review or disapprove any finding of a board of adjustment, and when it came to a general question of railroad wages, he appointed a non-partisan board of public men and not a board representing interested parties.

The brotherhoods will show a wise sense of strategy if they amend their plan so as to require approval of all wage increases, by the governmental representatives on the Board of Directors, or by a representative of the government not connected with the operating corporation. As it now stands, the wage machinery renders their plan vulnerable at the very point at which it is most likely to be attacked. Such an amendment will not in the least jeopardize the essential principles of the plan. It will strengthen the partisanship of labor and government by writing into the compact the principle that no man can be judge in his own cause.

Back on Again

OF all Mr. Wilson's addresses that one in which he deals with the cost of living does his memory and insight as little credit as any. Until my treaty is signed, says the President, our national life will remain "profoundly affected and disarranged"; "there can be no confidence in industry, no calculable basis for credits, no confident buying or systematic selling, no certain prospect of employment, no normal restoration of business, no hopeful attempt at reconstruction or the proper reassembling of the dislocated elements of enterprise." If this is true, why was it that on December 2nd, telling Congress that "the moment we knew the armistice to have been signed we

took the harness off," Mr. Wilson declared: "It is surprising how fast the process of return to a peace footing has moved in the three weeks since the fighting stopped"? For "reconstruction" he then had only a patronizing smile. "It will not be easy to direct it any better than it will direct itself," he said.

Today, in haste, the President asks for legislation. Very different was his tone when there was ample time for action. "Our people," he said the 2nd of December, "do not wait to be coached and led. . . . Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly tangled, because they would pay no attention to them, and go their own way. . . . The American business man is of quick initiative." And quickest of all, he now discovers, is the profiteer.

We had in Washington, up to the time of the armistice, a federal Food Administration. It dealt directly with those factors which the President now reviews for the benefit of Congress. When Mr. Wilson moves in generalities it is difficult to follow him. He declares the government must "assume a national control of the processes of distribution"; "Nothing less," he says, "will suffice." But what is "a national control of the process of distribution"? Is it what the Socialists want? Or is it old-fashioned "regulation"? Or one of the ten thousand gradations in between? When Mr. Wilson ventures into concrete statement, however—declares, for instance, that we must have regulations for cold storage houses and licenses for dealers in food—he suggests many activities which the federal Food Administration was already performing when he himself killed it. The Food Administration placed warehouse owners and cold storage men and wholesalers and large retailers under license. It enforced regulations against hoarding; it made positive innovations in the way of zone systems for livestock shipments and distributive points for the shipment of western fruits; and it laid down rules governing the profit which it considered in various lines of trade to be fair and non-profiteering. And these rules it enforced under penalty of a suspension of license. When Swift & Co. sold eggs in New York City at 51c. a dozen, after the Administration had fixed 48½c. as a maximum, the right to purchase and sell eggs in New York City was taken away from Swift & Co. for a period of thirty days.

In November of last year we had a Food Administration completely organized, smoothly running, well established in popular confidence. Mr. Wilson killed that Administration, killed it when it was successfully administering measures of that very sort which Mr. Wilson—in his present discovery of a "domestic problem"—now puts be-

fore the country as panaceas. No Food Administration built as ours was, no surface scratching of the sort Mr. Wilson now advocates, will build "a national control of the processes of distribution." Mr. Wilson is playing with words again. "To have brought it all out in the open," he says, "will accomplish the greater part of the result we seek." He will be mistaken, as badly mistaken as he was when he thought that merely to preach the doctrine of self-determination and no armaments was to accomplish the greater part of that earlier result we sought in vain. The American system of food distribution, built from end to end on an ideal of profiteering rather than of service, will prove as formidable an antagonist as M. Clemenceau himself.

Had Mr. Wilson kept the Food Administration alive he would not, in that single act, have removed the major causes of our present discontent. But he would have shut off much of the sabotage of the last eight months, and had us, all along, in a state not greatly distant from that at which his present proposals are directed. The Attorney-General, Mr. Wilson says, is getting into action. The Attorney-General, let us note, has called for assistance from the former State Food Administrators—ex-members of that effective organization which Mr. Wilson himself put out of existence. Eight months ago, with a jibe for leading-strings and "reconstruction," Mr. Wilson announced to Congress that he had taken the harness off. To-day, with the horse nowhere in sight, he announces that he will put it on again.

A Disgrace

THOSE who hailed the fall of Bela Kun as a triumphant demonstration of the League of Nations in operation were a bit premature. A Hapsburg reigns in Budapest assisted by the armies of a Hohenzollern. How this extraordinary result was achieved is not altogether clear but the main facts appear to be these: Before Bela Kun was overthrown the Peace Conference negotiated secretly with the Hungarian trade unions promising them recognition and a lifting of the blockade if they replaced the Communists by a moderate socialist government. Simultaneously the Rumanians were permitted or urged to advance on Budapest. It is this phase of the matter which is most obscure. What encouragement did they have from the Allies? We do know that the conservative press of Paris gloated over the military invasion. There is some reason for believing that Franchet d'Esperey, the French political general in the Near East, was averse neither to the Rumanian adven-

ture nor to the monarchical restoration. And Perlinax, voice of French militarism, writes in the *Echo de Paris*: "We have never felt that our alliance would find safety in the founding of democratic states in Germany and Austria-Hungary and we shall not regret the shifting of scenery in Hungary."

That influences, powerful both in the French Foreign Office and in the High Command would welcome a Hapsburg in Hungary and Austria and a Romanoff in Russia is not to be doubted. Throughout the war that peculiar combination of French royalism, clericalism, finance, and militarism, about which Americans know so little, but which all republican Frenchmen dread, has had a peculiar sympathy for the Hapsburgs. That there are French influences at work in Central Europe abetting the restoration is highly probable, and it would be illuminating to know just what are the respective roles of Franchet d'Esperey as a commander in the field, and Clemenceau as president of the Peace Conference. It is all very obscure. But those who remember the separate armistice with Hungary made by Franchet d'Esperey after the Allied armistice and in contradiction of it—this armistice was never published, but caused a great commotion in inner circles at the time—will be inclined to doubt whether the Clemenceau government really controls the political activity of its generals. For French militarism is a living fact, and like German militarism before it, does not regard itself as altogether responsible to the civil authorities.

The result puts the Peace Conference in a pitiable position. Its promises to the Hungarian Socialists are brutally violated, and the Hungarians, as the price of their reliance on the big Powers, are invaded, looted, starved, and killed by a horde of vindictive enemies, while to cap the climax the monarchy is restored. Perhaps the Rumanians can be induced to retire, but in retiring they will not bring the dead to life, nor restore what they have destroyed, nor convince any decent person in the wide world that these escapades of the "League" in establishing democracy are not palpable and disgusting frauds. A more sickening combination of betrayal, cruelty, and hypocrisy was never exhibited, and if now the conference recognizes the Archduke, if it gives to him support denied to the Hungarian Communists, there will be no shred of doubt left that the League is the Holy Alliance come to life again and an execrable cheat upon mankind.

The lesson for Russia is obvious. In Hungary the Allies bargained with non-Bolshevik democrats, and allowed them to be betrayed. In Russia they are bargaining with Kolchak and Denikin who make no pretence of democracy except through

their propagandists here in search of loans and troops. Should they win in Russia, how does Mr. Wilson propose to enforce the vague promises of democracy he has secured? If Rumania can defy the Peace Conference, what could an autocrat in Moscow do? The Allied policy in Hungary has led to a Hapsburg; Allied policy in Russia will lead to a Romanoff or some other royal house. The fact is we are being used throughout Europe and Asia as the backers of the Black Reaction—our bed fellows are all that is vicious in the system we set out to destroy. Betraying the German democracy, the Hungarian, the Russian, flouting the British and the French, aggrandizing the Japanese imperialists in Siberia, creating a Polish Empire, restoring Hapsburgs, playing with the Tsar's courtiers, and all in the name of high principles, it is a record of disgrace so deep that we shall not know how to answer before history for our complacency. For in cheating the democracies of the world we have stained our own with dishonor.

The Brotherhood Plan, or What?

IT is now nine months since the armistice was signed, and as yet the President and his cabinet have not adopted a railroad policy. For seven months rival plans have been pitted against each other in Congress, but no one plan has made any substantial progress. None has received a favorable committee report, and none can claim a favorable consensus of opinion either in House or Senate. As far as Congress and the Administration are concerned, there has been nothing but drift.

The discussion has served a useful turn, however, for it has furnished the strongest argument in favor of the railroad brotherhoods' plan for public ownership and democratic management of the railroads. It has demonstrated the utter futility of all other plans now before Congress. They are either financially unreliable, or they involve a measure of government guarantee of private ownership which is socially dangerous and politically impossible. And none of them offers even an approach to a solution of the problem of railroad labor.

To be acceptable, a railroad policy must promise three things. It must give assurance that it can provide at reasonable cost the necessary capital to rehabilitate and healthily expand the railroad system of the country. It must retain the economies and social advantages of unified control, without sacrifice of efficiency or initiative. And it must, so far as the public interest permits, satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the railway workers

for a large share of control over the conduct of railroad business. Judged by this standard all plans except that of the brotherhoods fail completely.

FUTILE REGULATION

The Interstate Commerce Commission's plan, which has come nearer to making progress in Congress than any other, is demonstrably useless. It can hardly be called even an attempt to meet the present crisis. The plan, as embodied in the Esch-Pomerene bills in the House and Senate, is a patchwork amendment of the present Interstate Commerce Act. The bills have been filled up with all the pet measures urged by the Interstate Commerce Commission almost since its organization, together with a few new proposals thrown in which have no particular relation to the present railroad problem. Permissive pooling, federal regulation of railroad securities, regulation of minimum as well as maximum rates, further control over intra-state rates, certificates of public security for new construction, control over transmission of intelligence, modification of the Panama Canal act provisions relating to railroad owned steamship lines, transfer of jurisdiction over coastwise shipping from the Shipping Board to the Commission, these and similar proposals go to make up the bill.

The Commission's plan suggests no way out of the financial impasse into which the railroads have gotten themselves. It retains the principle of private railroad financing, but offers no remedy for the well-known fact that the railroads cannot finance themselves. It is unnecessary to go into the causes. Speculative and predatory railroad construction for hold-up purposes, consolidation on a basis of inflated capitalization, vast projects of expansion and monopoly in fields in which the railroads had no legitimate concern, competitive rate wars and resulting competitive rate adjustments together with competitive free services which depleted railroad revenues, these, no less than the rising cost of operation and of capital, are to blame. The fact that railroad credit is demoralized no one will deny. With a very few exceptions among the strong roads, the railroads are not in a position to obtain the necessary new capital without governmental assistance. Nothing less than an unconscionably high level of rates can restore railroad credit without government aid, and such a level the Commission never should and certainly never will permit.

The plan makes only the most hesitating and ineffectual effort to meet the problem of securing efficiency through unified control. Our transportation system has grown up in a welter of competitive rivalries which have distorted the rate structure, violently wrenched traffic out of its normal and

economical path, set up exclusive terminal monopolies, and unnecessarily duplicated facilities, at every point sacrificing social efficiency for competitive advantage. Much progress has been made by the Railroad Administration in eliminating the social waste of a competitive railroad system. The Commission proposes to undo all this, and throw the railroads back into competitive chaos. Its only positive suggestions are, first, that it should be given authority to allow pooling of earnings and equipment, and consolidation of railroads, where the railroads themselves ask for it; and second, in case of emergency only, to compel common use of terminals and equipment.

The first provision is useless and dangerous. Our transportation system contains railroads that are financially and strategically weak, as well as railroads that are strong. A system of permissive pooling and consolidation will enable the strong railroads to dictate to the weak. Consolidation will again depend, as it has in the past, on the intrigues and private conspiracies of bankers and promoters, and railroad finances will be yet further sapped by banking commissions and syndicate profits. At most the Interstate Commerce Commission could interpose a veto. It could not force the railroads to do what was right. And considering the vast activities already carried on by the Commission, and the extreme complexity of the transactions that would be involved, even this veto power could hardly be expected to be very effective.

The second provision, for compulsory common use of terminals and equipment, is weak, not only because it is restricted to times of emergency, but because it provides for regulation in a field in which direct administration alone can be effective. The Railroad Administration was able to achieve some degree of unified operation only because it was operating the railroads rather than regulating them, and because with the government guarantee, it could ruthlessly disregard the private competitive interests of the individual roads. The Interstate Commerce Commission would be limited by these interests, protected as they are under a system of regulations by constitutional restraints and the cumbersome machinery of judicial review.

The Commission has no recommendations on the labor problem, and the bill does not refer to it.

DANGEROUS GUARANTEE

It is because all such schemes of perfected and sublimated regulation are obviously impracticable, that the more far sighted supporters of private railroading have become convinced that the system will go to pieces unless the government directly or indirectly puts its own credit behind the railroads. The

demand for a government guarantee of earnings is the result of this conviction. The theory, as its leading advocate has expressed it, is that since the government controls the rates, and hence the earnings, of the railroads, and since their only financial danger arises out of the fact that the government might not carry out its constitutional duty of allowing a fair return on railroad property, the government should assume financial responsibility for its own mistakes. It should provide, apparently, a sort of burglary insurance against its own unconstitutional and confiscatory rate regulation.

But the rate structure is only one of the factors that affect earnings. Another factor, and a very important one, is the amount of business which the railroads do. The earnings of a railroad in the coal districts, for instance, depend largely upon the demand for coal among industries and individual consumers, and this in turn depends upon the amount of business which the industries have on hand, as well as on the severity of the winter. Grain carrying roads, to take another instance, will flourish with bumper crops, and languish if the harvest is poor. The guarantee proposal involves a guarantee not only against governmental mistakes of judgment, but against crop failures, commercial depressions, floods, strikes, and all the other factors that might affect railroad receipts.

But this is not the most dangerous aspect of a government guarantee. It is well known that the most serious criticism has been directed against the equipment and supply purchases of many of the railroads. In the great Five Per Cent rate case, for instance, much evidence was laid before the Interstate Commerce Commission showing identity of financial interest between prominent railroad officials and directors, and companies which supplied fuel, rails or equipment. Recent attempts to prohibit interlocking directorates have only hit at one manifestation of this evil. Can the government safely leave unsupervised railroad expenditures of this character when it is holding the financial bag? A government guarantee must of necessity mean a progressive extension of government control over all the expenditures of the railroads. It means constant dispute and constant accusations of graft and favoritism and secret profit.

But the conclusive argument against any form of government guarantee is that it would be highly unjust and utterly unacceptable to the railroad employees. Suppose that a labor dispute arises. The employees make demands, which the railroads reject. There is a strike or a lockout. The railroad managers can sit back and bide their time. They can let the employees starve and the grass grow on the tracks, for the government has guaranteed to make good any loss. If we mistake not labor

will go to almost any length rather than submit to a scheme which makes the government a sustaining ally of the employers in any labor dispute.

Various modifications of the straight guarantee plan are proposed. Generally, it is proposed to guarantee only minimum earnings, and divide anything above the minimum between the government, the railroads, and, as a sop to labor, with the employees. On the few strong roads which would earn more than the guarantee, such an arrangement would slightly mitigate the evil features of the plan. But the weaker roads, generally the ones that have suffered from financial mismanagement or dishonesty, would present the evils in their most glaring form.

Other plans substitute for a direct guarantee to individual roads, an obligation on the part of the government to fix rates, in a given district, which will insure a stated return, say six per cent on all the railroad property in the district. Generally it is provided that a share of the excess profits of the prosperous roads shall go into a guarantee fund, of which all or a part shall be distributed among the individual railroads whose earnings fall below the stated return. It is perhaps a sufficient criticism of this proposal to quote Commissioner Clark, one of the most experienced members of the Interstate Commerce Commission: "This would put upon the Commission the impossible. No man can figure out a level of rates which for the next year will produce closely a certain percentage on a given sum of money." If the proposal means no more than that the Commission shall make its best guess, it will not assure financial credit. If it means more, it is virtually a direct guarantee, for it must be accompanied by a governmental fund to make up deficits.

The logic of this is recognized by the National Transportation Conference, which has provided in its plan a national railroad fund, to which the government shall advance an initial \$500,000,000, and the prosperous railroads a share of their excess earnings. The fund is to be used in making up deficits in the total earnings of the district, the subsidy necessary to make up such deficit being divided among all the companies in proportion to their earnings. Of course the strong roads will fight the proposal, and indeed any proposal involving guarantee of earnings to their weak competitors, to the last ditch. They will claim it is unconstitutional, and keep the matter in litigation for years. But even if the plan can be put through, it has all the inherent vice of a direct and frank subsidy.

NATIONALIZATION

If the railroads under public regulation cannot finance themselves, and if the government will not

finance them as long as they are run for private profit, it necessarily follows that the government must itself take over the ownership and ultimate control of the railroads. There are several proposals looking in this direction. Mr. Victor Morawetz, an eminent lawyer and former railroad director, has prepared the most comprehensive plan. It involves compulsory consolidation of all the railroads, through the power of eminent domain if necessary, into fifteen or twenty large regional corporations. The whole system is to be controlled by a federal board appointed by the President, with power to remove any director or executive officer of any regional corporation. A specified number of the directors of the corporations are to be appointed by the federal board, the remainder by the stockholders. The government is to guarantee the bonds, and a minimum return on the stock, of the corporations.

This is virtually government operation, though tempered by a certain participation in control on the part of stockholders. And it is in substance little different from government ownership, for the corporate bondholders are in no way different from holders of government bonds, and the stockholders are but government bondholders with a chance of participation in profits. A plan submitted to Congress by Nathan Amster, representing one of the security holders' associations, differs from Mr. Morawetz's plan mainly in that only one corporation instead of fifteen or twenty is to be formed, and that its board of directors must be appointed, by the President, for life, four from the stockholders, and one each from labor, commerce, and the shippers.

Plans of this character fulfill two of the tests by which a railway policy must be measured. They are financially practicable, and they provide for unified control. They fail to meet the third. They will not satisfy the insistent demand of the railway employees to be admitted into a copartnership with the government in managing the railroads. They admit capital into such a copartnership, but not labor. The Morawetz plan gives labor no representation, the Amster plan only a paltry one out of seven directors, while the stockholders have a majority. Do the widows and orphans and elderly ladies and professional men who own most of our railroad stock know so much more about railroading than the workers and officials who spend their lives operating railroads? From the point of view of efficiency alone, the employees will be far more alive to their responsibilities than the average investor.

These plans for a partnership of capital and government are several years out of date. During the past two years the railroad brotherhoods have

learned that in an ultimate test of strength they have the power to enforce their demands. Capital and government combined cannot withstand them. Compulsory arbitration is out of the question. What is to prevent the brotherhoods from making repeated demands for higher wages, until the traffic can pay no more and transportation is paralyzed? Only their sense of responsibility for the industry in which they are engaged. As long as they are in opposition, with capital and government against them, they will feel no responsibility. To give the railway employees a large share in the management of the railways is no longer a question of policy, it has become a question of necessity.

The logic of the situation is inescapable. Our past policy of public regulation and private financing is doomed because it is financially impracticable. A government guarantee is financially feasible, but from the social and political point of view, preposterous. The traditional policy of railroad competition, with its wasteful conflict of competitive railroad corporations, is universally condemned; but the remedy usually proposed, of permissive pooling and consolidation, is worse than the disease. There must therefore be a radical, compulsory consolidation of the railroads into a unified non-competitive national system, and this means of necessity condemnation of the railroads by eminent domain. Government operation without the active and willing cooperation of the employees tends toward stagnation and bureaucracy, and does not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the railroad workers; hence there must be a considerable participation of employees and officers in railway management. Thus we are led by successive steps to a full acceptance of the general features of the railway brotherhoods' plan.

The New REPUBLIC *A Journal of Opinion*

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1919, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY
PHILIP LITTELL
WALTER E. WEYL

FRANCIS HACKETT
ALVIN JOHNSON
WALTER LIPPMANN

CHARLES MERZ
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

Poland and the Jews

ONE goes to Poland with a firm conviction that its civilization is of the West. Latin was the language of its ancient culture. Did not Copernicus lay the basis of our modern outlook at Cracow? One feels, as one cannot feel in Russia or Turkey, that the ancestors of its people passed through the same formative influences, Renaissance, Reformation and "Enlightenment," as our own. One sight seemed to contradict these impressions even in the first walk through Warsaw streets. The snow was on the ground. The sledges, the crows and the gilded Byzantine church suggested Russia. But the Jews in the streets reminded me of Salonika. Here was a race living, by its own choice, that life of separation which is normal in the East. In Turkey one expects it. Every race has there its own language, its own costume, its own religion. The Jews there are not more separate than Greeks or Armenians. In Poland this eastern phenomenon surprises. Even in the larger towns the majority of the men, including even some who are wealthy, continue to wear their traditional costume—the black gown, the little black cap, the inevitable beard and the peculiar curl prescribed by ritual. These men in strange garb talk no Polish among themselves: their speech is still the German jargon which they brought with them long centuries back from the Rhine. Thus it happens that from his first years of childhood the young Pole grows up with the sense that these strangely dressed men with the incomprehensible speech are foreigners in his land. Why it is so, I do not know. You will see no black gowns in Hungary, nor hear Yiddish in the streets, and the Hungarian Jew speaks Magyar at home and feels himself a Hungarian citizen.

The outer garb covers a personality which is as little Polish as the dress is European. The average orthodox Jew, even in the middle-class, has grown up in a mental world which nowhere touches that of his Polish neighbor. His education has been almost exclusively religious. He knows Hebrew as few of us ever knew our Latin. I have heard poor Jewish children talking Hebrew as they played on the streets. His wits have been exercised in the gymnastic of Talmudic casuistry. Of European history or modern science he knows (or used to know) nothing. If he is an idealist (and this persecuted race is rich in idealists) it is not the Polish nationalist dream, the socialist Utopia, or the scientist's passion to know the causes of things, that allure him, but rather his secret, dis-

dainful, theocratic vision of a chosen race true to its destiny and bound by its law. It may be a defect in my mental make-up, but I am not able to admire the wisdom which takes as its chosen field for idealism the obstinate resolve to observe the Sabbath rather than Sunday as the weekly day of rest. But I do bow with a sort of veneration before the self-sacrifice of this race which in Poland has handicapped itself in the daily competition of industry because it will not compromise with the law. The mental gulf is deep. It is so deep that Jewish girls of the middle class, who have had a conventional modern education feel themselves aliens at their marriage with young men who were bred in the orthodox lore.

If the reader asks why the Poles alone of all races, professedly western in their culture, live with this impassable gulf between themselves and their Jews, I am somewhat puzzled to find the answer. Firstly, they were not, until today, a ruling people: they could not attract others to themselves. Secondly, there are historical reasons. It may be a consequence of the wide cultural and fiscal autonomy conceded by the old Polish kingdom in the past, it is also the fact that the Russians deliberately widened the gulf. Thirdly, the general cultural level of the Poles themselves was too low for a bridge to be built on an intellectual basis. The Jew, whatever his status in the world, had his own ancient culture. The poorer Pole, unlettered and untaught, possessed no culture at all. His one spiritual possession was his Catholic faith. It is, I think, the traditional association of Polish nationality with the Catholic religion, which makes the barrier against the Jews so difficult to lower. The Pole emphasized his Catholicism against his Prussian Protestant conquerors in the West and his Russian Orthodox conquerors in the East. The few Protestant Poles in East Prussia and Silesia lost all sense of their Polish nationality. Ask a peasant or a woman in any mixed area, if he or she is a Pole, and the affirmative answer will usually be, "I am a Catholic." I have often heard that answer myself, and for me it gave the clue. In Hungary, on the other hand, the Calvinist minority was always as much Magyar as the Catholic majority, and religion never came to be a part of nationality, with the result that the Jews were accepted as equal citizens. In Poland, as in Turkey, nationality and religion are one idea. The Jews are in sentiment excluded from the Polish nation because they are not Catholics. A Jew is

really adopted as a Pole, only when he compounds with the world, by accepting baptism.

So far as I could gather, the open preaching of anti-Semitism and the organized persecution of the Jews in Poland are comparatively recent phenomena. A Pole will always begin any conversation about the Jew by recalling the traditional tolerance of the Polish state. That is, I fear, a myth: it was on the persecution both of the Protestants and the Orthodox that Prussia and Russia fastened as a pretext for the first partition. The fact is, that modern anti-Semitism in Poland has an obvious economic root. Until the middle of the last century the Jews were the only middle class in Poland, and the only trading class. Poles were either landowners, peasant owners, or laborers. In the last fifty years Poles have increasingly taken to trade and even to industry, though the names of most of the larger firms are still preponderantly German or Jewish. Usually, these magnates are baptized Jews. This belated industrial development in Poland, delayed by the heavy hand of Tsardom, brought Jewish and Christian traders and shopkeepers when it came at length, into sharp competition. As in Austria, so in Poland, this economic competition was obvious material for political agitators. M. Roman Dmowski, the founder of the National Democratic ("N. D.") party, did what Lueger and the "Christian Socialists" did in Vienna, he roped the small middle-class man, who felt the pressure of Jewish competition, into an essentially Conservative Nationalist party. Before the war, his was a Russophil policy: he was a favorite at the Tsar's court, and represented in the Duma a tendency that was relatively reactionary even in that backward assembly. In Poland, though his party relied for funds on the big landowners, it won popular support by a violent and entirely reckless campaign against the Jews. To this party belong not merely M. Dmowski, by far the cleverest of Polish politicians, but also M. Paderewski, and most of the present ministry. From specimens of their election literature which I saw, one might suppose that they fought the first election in free Poland mainly on the Jewish issue, combined with the subtle suggestion that most Socialists are Jews, and all Socialists, Bolsheviks. Ugly illustrated posters and leaflets, issued officially by this party, depicting the Jew as a serpent or a vampire, appealed to the numerous illiterate electors, and its newspaper press kept the agitation going from day to day by incessant anti-Jewish articles. I procured copies of some of these sinister popular appeals to race hatred, and in the municipal elections a little later, actually myself saw an "N. D." car, decorated with all the Allied flags, scattering an anti-Jewish leaflet in the main street

of Warsaw. For the present state of mind of brutal fanaticism which breaks out in massacre, this ruling party is directly responsible. Itself at bottom the party of the big landed interest, it has used anti-Jewish prejudice as a demagogic appeal, in order to win the masses from the Socialist and peasant parties.

I must in fairness mention the charges usually advanced against the Jews. Because many or most of the town dealers and retailers are Jews, they are said to be the causes of high prices and the food shortage. In point of fact the real reason for the anger of the Polish dealer and shopkeeper against the Jew is that his margin of profit is so small, that even the cooperative societies can hardly compete with him. Poland is suffering from an acute monetary crisis, but the people are too ignorant to understand the real causes of the decline of the value of the mark. The economic case of the Polish masses is desperate mainly because a rise of wages has not followed the rise of prices. Prices rose ten times in the war, wages from three to five times. No doubt, dealers, including the Jews, did hoard and speculate, but the more guilty "profiteer" was usually the Polish landlord and farmer. It is the obvious cue of the profiteering landowner and the employer who will not raise wages, to blame the Jews for the high cost of living. Again, they are accused of being pro-German, partly because they rejoiced at the defeat of Tsardom and partly because the Germans during the occupation found it convenient to employ them, since they all speak German. That fact attracted notice, only because the Russians had on principle refused to employ any Jews at all. Half Polish society, one is apt to forget, was pro-German, or as it was called, Activist, until the crash, and the President himself, General Pilsudski, fought most gallantly on the Austro-German side against Russia. Elsewhere it is counted a crime against the Jews that they are neutral in the racial feuds of the Poles against the Ukrainians. The most recent charge is that all Jews are Bolsheviks. Some young Jews are certainly Communists, but the mass of the race detests the thought of social revolution as it detests every new thing.

I will not attempt to describe the successive waves of "pogroms" which have swept over the Polish Jews since November last. I happened to be in Poland during a relatively quiet interval. I saw no pogroms, but I heard enough in my talks with Polish officials, officers and politicians to understand the atmosphere of the pogrom. I myself heard the military commandant at Pinsk declare in cold blood that he would have to shoot one in ten of the population. About ten days later thirty-five Jews were shot by the troops in Pinsk, without a

pretense of trial. Sometimes the number of killed rose (as at Lemberg) as high as eighty; sometimes whole streets of Jewish houses were burned down, more often there was pillage, beating and insult, but little killing. I refrain from dwelling on this painful subject of pogroms, because though one cannot insist too sharply on their cessation, it would be a grave mistake to suppose that they are the real evil. Let me say, however, in plain language, that these Catholic Polish Christians do, on occasion, with their troops at their head, massacre as brutally as ever Turks massacred Christians, and the authorities show a Turkish tolerance to these outrages. But pogroms, after all, are only the occasional aggravation of a daily martyrdom. The same fanaticism shows itself in every relation of life: Jews have said to me repeatedly that no Christian employer will employ a Jew: certainly most of the big employers on principle exclude Jews. A large number of Jews (they are one-third of the population) barred out under Russian rule, were taken into the service of the Warsaw tramways during the German occupation. They were all instantly dismissed at the Polish Revolution. In a typical country town (I speak of what I saw at Vloclawek) the big modern factories will employ no Jews. They can work only in a few small home industries of their own. That is true also of Lodz. Some of the factories belong to Jews, but even in them no Jewish operatives can be employed. The fact is that anti-Semitism has now filtered down into the working class. Polish workmen will not work with Jews. Jewish workmen must create their own separate trade unions. When, at the revolution a Workers Council (Rada) on the Soviet model was created in all the towns, the Socialist leaders had the greatest difficulty in persuading the Polish workmen to admit the Jewish organizations, and when I left Poland, at the end of March, they had not everywhere succeeded. West of Poland, socialism knows no barriers of race. In Poland, the Jewish socialists must keep apart, in their own separate organization, the Bund. Though the Polish Constitution imposes no legal disability on the Jew, I believe it is the fact that no unbaptized Jews (it would be safer to say, virtually none) have been admitted to official posts, or to any rank in the civil service. My notebooks are full of little details of acts of oppression against Jews—interferences with their clubs, with their newspapers, and open brutality in the street. One heard of these things everywhere. The broad facts are enough: I feel a temperamental reluctance to recount these things. No Jew was safe from daily insult, while a Chinese wall excluded the Jews from every region of Polish social life, save in extremely radical circles. The whole condition of this so-

ciety rather resembled that of a mixed white and colored community than a European land.

The Poles, politically and culturally an immature and backward people, have won the power to make their land a hell for its three million Jews, by no merit of their own, but simply by the victory first of Germans over Russians, and then of the Allies over the Germans. What they do to other races is some concern of ours. If the diagnosis of this essay be correct, then undoubtedly the root of the evil, whether Poles or Jews be to blame for it, is the excessive isolation of this essentially foreign racial element. To conclude, however, as the Poles do, that the cure for this evil is to bring the Jews into the framework of Polish nationality, is surely to betray a complete ignorance of the meaning of the idea of nationality. Race and language are trifles compared with the historic gulf between these two peoples. Each has suffered, each has struggled, but never in the same cause and with the same sentiments. Mazzini wrote in vain, if we are going to say that aliens who share none of the traditions, none of the memories, none of the hopes, none of the religious faith of the Poles, can partake of Polish nationality. Good citizens of the Polish State they may be, if they are permitted to wish it well, but even this they will not be, until the Poles cease the effort to beat them into patriotism. None the less, this Polish reasoning is sound, in so far as it betrays a perception that some social bond, some idea of union, some human tie, must be discovered if their state, with its three million Jews, is to cohere. The bond cannot be nationality. Let them seek it in common work. In this modern world, it is much more important that men produce, shoulder to shoulder, and share common interests as workers and creators than it is that they profess the same historic nationality. When Jewish workers are admitted to every factory and to the civil service, when the separate trade unions, and the separate socialist workers' parties fuse, the Jewish problem will be solved in Poland. Liberalism, one may say in passing, exists in Poland neither as an idea nor as a party. The idea of socialism and its work for common human ends, free from this curse of racial fanaticism, is the one force in Poland which gives any hope for the future, and it is only in so far as the weak and backward Polish socialism movement grows in courage and numbers and fidelity to its ideas, that any radical solution can be found for the Jewish problem.

Failing this radical social solution, none of the obvious remedies seem to me particularly hopeful. The political vote is useless to the Jews. Jewish parties were and are sharply divided into many groups with divergent policies. The orthodox stand

by themselves. Their socialists are at war with their middle class. They were often robbed of their voting chances by skilfully arranged electoral areas. But if they had won a proportionate number of seats in the Diet, their case would have rather been worse than better. If they had become a balancing party, with a big vote to sell, the answer to this use of power would have been only a sharper application of the rod of persecution. In some of the Radas (Workmen's Councils) they had this balancing power between the Left (Communists) and Right (Polish Socialist party), and they hardly dared to use it, because they knew that any act or decision which would cause it to be said that Jews are exerting a political influence, would only expose them to further persecution. It is dangerous to be a Jew, but most dangerous of all to be a Jew who can be accused of wielding power.

If it is of their rights as a minority that one thinks, then obviously it is important that they should have their own schools, which must receive their fair share of public money. The control of these schools ought to be in the hands of the Jewish community on a democratic basis. While they clearly ought to teach the Polish language and history, the instruction must begin in the mother-tongue, which is Yiddish. Cultural autonomy on these lines is a right which must be secured to every minority in Europe.

It is on this matter of schools that controversy mainly turns in Poland. To me it seems curiously unreal. Here is a race liable to be massacred on occasion, habitually insulted in its daily life, excluded in fact from the state's service and barely able to live by minor crafts and petty trade, because it is excluded by sheer fanaticism from the chief industries, and we offer it as a solution—Jewish schools! The League of Nations, we are told, will impose certain obligations on the Polish state in regard to its Jews. The League as it exists today is primarily a Grand Alliance. Poland feels herself an Ally and is regarded in Paris as the indispensable barrier against Germany and Russia. French officers are training and even commanding its army. French diplomacy, strongly clerical in its tendencies, is the only effective representative of Europe or the League in Warsaw today. The Allies failed to stop the little war of the Poles against the Ukrainians. They will fail, even if they try, to stop the persecution of the Jews. No alliance ever yet contrived to control an ally. From an ally one wants an army, not virtue. While the League remains a militant alliance against Germans and Bolsheviks, it will achieve nothing for the Polish Jews, or for any other minority. It will no more succeed in controlling the Poles in this matter, than Mid-Victorian England in the Crimean days could

control the Turks, while it regarded them as allies. Its diplomatic agents will move in Polish society where no one meets a Jew, and only a very strong and exceptional man will risk his local popularity for the sake of the Jews. To place minorities (be they German or Jewish) under Poles and Czechs, and then to imagine that all will be well because some magic League of Nations will watch over them, is a pitiable self-deception. The Poles understand very well what their role in Europe is. Their role is to fill a rather onerous part in the French strategy of encirclement, and to keep a strong conscript army on the Vistula, while the French keep watch on the Rhine. They know very well that if they fill this role, they may treat Jews, Germans and other minorities as they please. That is a corollary of the new militarism. The way of escape? I see none from this false start. But more and more, day by day, the Polish Jew, like every wronged race and class in Europe, will seek his salvation in socialism.

On one fact, however, it is not too late to insist. The boundaries of Poland have not yet been drawn on its eastern side. Its armies are occupying the country beyond the Bug, but as yet they have no formal "mandate." Here the Jewish population is even denser than in Poland proper. Brest, Vilna, Pinsk and the rest, are overwhelmingly Jewish towns. This is the old Russian "Pale," in which even the villages are often Jewish, and since the devastation of 1915, when the Cossacks drove out the Orthodox peasants, the Jews have even taken to tilling the soil. One might press this case as strongly from the Lithuanian, the White Russian or the Ukrainian standpoint, for the Polish population here is a negligible minority. All these races will be wronged, but more especially the Jews, if the Polish frontier is drawn beyond the true Polish racial limits. I know a town in the Pale which had lived under Tsarist Russian, German, Ukrainian, Bolshevik and Polish rule. I asked the local Jews which, from their standpoint, was the best and worst. They had nothing, as Jews, against Germans or Bolsheviks. Neither persecuted. They all agreed that Polish rule was decidedly worse than that of Tsardom. The leaders of the Ukrainians, I imagine, would have said the same thing if I could have questioned them, but they were all in prison.

H. N. BRAILSFORD.

Night

Bed is too small to rest my tiredness,
I'll take a hill for pillow, soft with trees,
Now, draw the clouds up tight beneath my chin . .
God, blow . . . the moon . . . out, please. . . .

ELIZABETH J. COATSWORTH.

Notes on French Politics

FOUR months ago every one in France was asking, "When will the revolution come?" Today the question is: "Will there be a revolution?"

The situation is enigmatic. Some months ago, at a national meeting of the French Socialist party, Loriot, leader of the most extreme and uncompromising wing, said: "Revolution exists already in the facts. Conditions are ripe for it. But it does not exist in the spirit, for the people do not yet realize what the situation is." He went on to say that it could not be accurately forecast, but might break out at any time, and in this he was probably correct, for, looking carefully at the political and economic barometer in France one wonders how the present government has been able to "carry on."

To begin with, the government has bungled the financial problem, and that, perhaps, is all-important for France today. She groans under a debt of two hundred billion francs, or considerably more than half her national wealth. While Great Britain during the war paid 50 per cent of current war expenses by taxation, France paid less than 15 per cent; with Great Britain assuming this year a tax burden of 35 billion francs, France is raising only about 8 or 10. The people were lulled by the hope of "making Germany pay all," and with that hope the day of reckoning was deliberately postponed. In the face of this hopelessness the government has no constructive programme. Several months ago Klotz, minister of finances, after a prolonged demand for some sort of financial policy, proposed a tax of 25 per cent on capital. To the naturally terrific uproar from the propertied classes M. Klotz succumbed altogether, and asked the Bank of France for an advance of three billion, which was promptly refused. So the government financial programme lapsed under cries of "make Germany pay first." In May, the only practical effect of M. Klotz's proposal to raise 1,800,000,000 francs by taxes, chiefly on consumption, was to send even higher the cost of living and the government thus far refuses to commit itself to any programme involving serious sacrifices by the possessing class.

The government likewise has no constructive economic policy. It showed its shortsightedness in refusing to accept Mr. Wilson's "integral reparations" programme, whereby Germany would have been made responsible directly for the damages to devastated areas—a plan that would, incidentally, have amounted to a much greater sum than France has been able to secure by way of indemnities. Instead, the Clemenceau cabinet pre-

ferred to receive "indemnities" direct from Germany, dispose of them as it liked, and remunerate the owners of devastated properties in whatever proportions it saw fit. This method gives rise to charges of favoritism and rotten politics; it is said that the amount of reparation the owner of ruined property receives depends largely on his political affiliations. Another instance of favoritism here, in the interests of the big manufacturers, was the prohibition, until recently, of the importation of all machinery from America, in spite of the crying needs of the ruined factories.

Already unpopular enough for its failure to improve economic conditions, charges of personal corruption beyond number are brought against members of the government, and belief in them finds a hold on the minds of a majority of the people. *Bonsoir*, a liberal Paris paper, has accused Clemenceau of the most vicious personal relations—said he was doomed to go down overwhelmed in a flood of scandals: among his ministers Klotz and Loucheur—the latter minister of reconstruction, a big manufacturer alleged to have lined his pockets during the war—are objects of popular odium. The Clemenceau government is the object of the most bitter attacks. The rigorous régime of the censorship has furnished deadly ammunition to the big guns assaulting the government position. Throughout the peace negotiations there was no such thing as freedom of expression of opinion. Long blank columns were of daily occurrence. One paper was totally suppressed for a week for making some forecast of the peace treaty which had already appeared in English papers; another was seized four times in one week for referring to comments on the peace made by Marshal Foch, which English papers had previously printed in full.

For some time *Le Matin*, the paper with the second largest circulation in France, has carried on a violent campaign against Clemenceau, and in favor of Briand. Important radical papers, such as *L'Oeuvre* and *Bonsoir*, though not socialist, have anathematized the government incessantly. And naturally the Socialists have continually harassed it.

In the face of such failures and such opposition, in the face of repeated predictions of an early collapse, in the face of a grave economic and financial crisis, of high prices and popular unrest, it is surprising the government still endures. Clemenceau's position has for four months been very weak, and it appeared that only his relation to the Peace Conference kept him in office. One has only to see an important session of the Chamber of Deputies to realize that the government is actually unpopular. Then why does he remain now that peace is signed? Very likely because the deputies are afraid of

endangering their position with the electorate; they lie low, play politics, wait for the election and in the meantime dance to the tune of the government fiddle—all but the ninety or one hundred of the extreme left.

And who will replace the government when it goes? Barring a revolution, it will not be these ninety or one hundred Socialists. They expect their members to increase to one hundred and fifty or two hundred in the next election, and in the meantime will participate in no ministry not predominantly socialist.

For the next government the betting is on M. Briand, who headed a ministry for some time during the war, as well as before it, and again burst into prominence some months ago with a vigorous speech on electoral reform. Since then he has hovered in the background, with the chances strong that he might assume the reins of government at any time. He is an astute politician of the Lloyd George type, willing to cater to whatever element of the Chamber supports him.

But even in the event of a new ministry, no violent general change of policy is to be expected. There are circumstances which make a peaceful change of government seem likely, and tend to counterbalance a more revolutionary trend. We must remember that France has come out of the war victorious, even though the victory be pyrrhic, even though the government's activity has consisted chiefly in giving anaesthetics—not in curing the patient,—an activity illustrated by the 14th of July "Fête de la Victoire," when four million francs were spent in festooning Paris and impairing the natural beauty of the Champs Elysées by a double row of ornamental poles draped with flags and electric lights. So are the people encouraged to think only of the magnificent triumph of France, "the state on the frontier of civilization, guarding the liberty of the world," as the reactionary press glibly asserts.

Along with this sedulously encouraged intoxication of victory goes the natural reaction which follows war, the psychology of a "patriotism" that represses liberal thinking, and takes the form of branding as "pro-German" and "Bolshevist" every attempt to remove the fetters of a reactionary win-the-war cabinet, or to improve the condition of the workers.

But more important and permanent than these factors, is France's large peasant population, patriotic, fundamentally conservative, owning its own land, prosperous during the war, and prosperous now under the régime of high prices. So traditionally conservative are they that most of the troops used to quell popular disturbances in Paris are from the farming districts. Yet of these fac-

tors which might counteract the revolutionary situation, the only tolerably stable one is the contented peasant on the land. For before long the glamour of victory will wear off, "patriotism" will fade as the people begin to realize their frightful economic and financial position, and as the government more and more conclusively manifests its helplessness before the crisis. Taxes will become heavier, the cost of living higher.

The high cost of living—this chief cause of popular revolt, and prime condition of revolution—has already had ominous results in France. The present situation is so serious that there have already been riots in Paris, shops broken into by exasperated women. This tense situation has only been aggravated by the strikes for shorter hours and higher wages, which have given reason to employers for putting up the prices of their goods. Realizing this vicious circle of increased pay and increased prices, the Confederation Générale du Travail some weeks ago made a considerable advance in its theories, and concluded that its aim should be, not simply increased pay and shorter hours, but "the total reorganization of the system of production and distribution."

"Total reorganization"—a people's bitter discontent smouldering in France today, may easily turn "total reorganization" to revolution. The cities, as in all such cases, are the most restless. The seaports, Bordeaux, Marseilles, Brest and Toulon, are hot beds of radicalism. Today it is no longer a case of "Paris against the rest of France," but of industrial centres such as Paris, Lyons, Lille, taking the lead and the others following.

The state of mind of the army is not reassuring to a government which counts on force to repress popular movements. Five years of continuous military service have bred deep discontent throughout the ranks, and frequent incidents illustrate the revolutionary trend of the "returning soldier." For instance, it is notorious that regiment after regiment of the hundred thousand soldiers brought into Paris to suppress manifestations on May Day had to be withdrawn and replaced, as the soldiers became unreliable after coming into contact with the Paris proletariat. Social disturbances, news of which has been rigorously suppressed by the censor, have clearly shown profound discontent. In the Black Sea fleet four ships' crews raised the red flag and were suppressed with difficulty. At Toulon, the sailors formed Soviets; in Brest, they are continually creating disorder. At Toulouse, three artillery regiments revolted, in protest against bad food, cruel discipline, and intervention in Russia. Incidentally, although the motive power behind the strikes and agitations has been primarily questions of wages and hours, this question of intervention

and sending munitions to Russia figures very largely in labor and socialist protests against the government.

Unemployment, another ally of revolution, is a problem now, and will be a serious one in another two or three months, when after demobilization only two or three classes remain under the colors. I have been solicited upon the streets of Paris by demobilized soldiers who said they could find no work, and that the government was doing nothing for them.

With the economic, financial and labor situations continually growing worse, with these many existing symptoms and conditions of popular revolt, one thing is certain; if the propertied class—those who are commonly said to find it easier to give their sons for their country than their wealth—if the intransigent possessors of wealth remain unwilling to make extraordinary material sacrifices,—then the revolution which Great Britain is so heroically avoiding, and to which Italy seems doomed, will certainly sweep France into its vortex.

To stabilize the present regime, the part played by the United States will be of tremendous importance, and our financial assistance on a very large scale will for a long time be necessary. But if a revolution should come, our attitude then will be of equal importance; and in this event there are fears, expressed to me by one of the Socialist leaders as warranted by our reactionary policy towards Hungary and Russia, lest the Anglo-Saxons might clamp down an economic blockade.

Sincerely friendly to France, we hope the present crisis may be surmounted by a "rapid evolution" rather than revolution, but it is difficult to discern on the horizon an indication of forces capable of arresting the tragic drift of events toward the abyss.

G. B. NOBLE.

The Advertising Man

VISITORS from abroad, from H. G. Wells and Arnold Bennett to Rupert Brooke, express almost child-like bewilderment in the face of what they call our "sky-signs." Coming to them with a fresher eye the grotesqueries of New York street advertising strike them with something of the emotion experienced by the young in looking through a graphically illustrated fairy-book. To them our advertising is saliently and essentially American. Its horrific impact on the eye astonishes them because they do not understand that the object of the advertising man is to assault the vision; it is like a man's coming to fight a duel on the understanding that his adversary shall use the rapier only to be confronted by a bludgeon.

It is this failure to grasp the first intention of our advertising artists in color and light that makes understandable the Englishman's exclamation in the classic story. A New Yorker was piloting his London guest about the thoroughfare miscalled the "White Way." Suddenly he stopped and pointed upwards: "See that sign!" he said ecstatically. The Englishman murmured something about not being able to help it. "It has 50,000 lights in it!" cried the American. "But, my dear chap," protested the Londoner, "doesn't that make it frightfully conspicuous!"

Broadway has never been so thrilling, to the present writer at least, as on those few nights last year when its pyrotechnics were dark. There is probably no street in the world to which darkness is so becoming. Unfathomable people brushed by you, their faces mercifully swathed in darkness. There was mystery in street-corners formerly tenanted by saloons. The sky and the stars seemed strangely close. It was curious, on Broadway, to be conscious of the sky and the stars . . . You conceived that you were threading a Florentine alley, for all the taxicabs! But the firmament of rust-defying corsets, of eternal brooms, of death-evading tires and timeless chewing-gums has succeeded the paler planets which are again lost in the great dimness beyond the penumbra of the advertising man's garish halo.

There are those to whom our advertising is the color in a drab world, who are convinced that the ugliness of subway kiosks and L stations is relieved by the chromatic splashes which adorn their sides, who find, in its ultimate bizarreries something appropriately modern, hence satisfying. To see a painted cow belonging to Horlick browsing over a lump of green paint is not a recompense for a distorted landscape, but, in cities, big cities, it must be said that the total effect of multi-colored advertising signs is to suggest the Babylonian, the Satalian, not without fittingness. In small towns, in mill cities, the advertising is hideous, depressing. Signs stand on bleak squares like hectic spots on a consumptive's cheek. Main Street is seen pitiful in the light of half a dozen scattered electric signs, meanly bedizened, shrinking from a light it does not court. At least Broadway has learned to be comfortable in the center of its own spotlight, to revel in it, like a prima donna of sorts.

The advertising man, the genius of America, is usually young, good-looking, sartorially perfect, with sleek hair and parti-colored shoes. Consciousness of the eminence of his position in American business has made him as complacent as Douglas Fairbanks. He does not conceal his awareness of the fact that he is the cornerstone of the most respectable American institutions; the newspapers

and magazines depend on him; Literature and Journalism are his hand maidens. He is the Fifth Estate . . . James Cabell speaks with accuracy of the great American weekly which prints fiction among its advertisements. Yet, for all his dignity, the advertising man is a good fellow none the less. At lunch time he is lavish and fluent, fecund in anecdote. He is on the right side of things, the optimistic side. He has no use for morbidity, irregularity. He is as patriotic as George M. Cohan. Usually he is married and does not conceal from you the fact that his salary is twice that of the President of the University from which he didn't graduate, since he deserted academic maunderings for the actualities. But he is likely to respect college presidents. Since they are themselves, along his own line, not meanly equipped . . .

Not only would our newspapers not be without the advertising man; they would not be so funny. If there is some question as to whether he relieves the monotony of subway kiosks there is no doubt whatever that he relieves the monotony of newspapers. When you get tired of the ironic invectives against Claude Kitchin on the editorial page of the newspaper which is by no means your favorite but which you nevertheless read because your favorite isn't published yet (since it probably couldn't get the ads!) you can turn to an ingenious article on Gladstone, headed by a great picture of the G. O. M., which tells you that his success as a statesman was due to the fact that he used a razor, in all essentials exactly like the Durham-Duplex. Precisely like, that is, except for the "safety" of the later instrument. Or to the theatrical columns and be invited to see Theda Bara in Cleopatra. "Why," you are asked, "did Caesar leave Rome?" You speculate. You wonder. You are led to believe that Theda Bara had something to do with it. She must be an interesting person to attract so celebrated a week-ender. Or, you are slyly told of Cleopatra, by way of historical diversion, that "her tailor was a florist." This, too, suggests that Theda is an interesting person, orchidaceous and amiable.

"Publicity" is the reigning philosophy, the magic conjuring word. The extent to which you employ it is the mark of your success. The advertising man is as necessary to the undertaker as he is to the actor and the politician. Recently the family of a well-known dramatic critic, a modest man with simple notions about interment, was horrified to read in the newspapers, a few days after his death, the statement that the deceased had left a "sealed envelope" with esoteric instructions as to his funeral. When he investigated the story, the son of the dead man found that it had been circulated by the publicity man of the fashionable

undertaking establishment which had charge of his father's body and had to write a privately published pamphlet in which he disposed of the story. The advertising man is the enfant terrible of the time, unabashed before the eternities. Even war needs him, to say nothing of Swift and Company. No doubt we should have seen, were it not for the emergence of the League of Nations, an increasing specialization in "war-publicity." America would probably have developed the snappiest war publicists in the world. The first act of a South American revolutionist would be to wire a New York agency for a publicity man, a live wire, who could put a revolution over, with neatness and dispatch. This is one of the greatest undeveloped professions which a lasting peace will render still-born as it will stifle the activities of the munition makers.

No longer content with selling you a million dollars' worth of "Life-Savers" a year or with making Ivory Soap seem indispensable to existence, the advertising man is now bent on rationalizing his success; he must crystallize his practice into a philosophy. The press drops books written by successful advertising men in increasing number; they are prepared to tell you how to live as well as to whom to commit yourself when you die. Their titles are usually invigorative, uplifting, Creative Living, The Secret of Success and such like. I refer to one of these genial guides because it is the latest and comes heralded with fanfares. It is called A Vital Need of the Times and is by Felix Orman. After many encomiums by the giants of industry and the giants of advertising comes a series of quotations. First, one from Emerson, Greatness in Business. Then one from Ruskin, Trade Has Its Heroisms. Then one from J. Ogden Armour, Enthusiasm. For some pages you read about what you expect. And then you come across a passage which is not what you expect:

"This brings me to a thought that I cannot help considering fundamental. I believe that our greatest danger lies, not in too little democracy, but in too much of it. An ardent disciple of the democratic idea, as applied to society and government, I cannot help believing that in a restrained, rational and disciplined democracy lies the hope of mankind. I regard with apprehension the emotional and purely theoretical and visionary conceptions of democracy, with their flamboyant promises and enervating individualism and spiritual canker. There are five great heresies in our life today—Socialism, destroying the fine spirit and stability of labor and industry; Feminism, endangering the very foundation props of the social structure; Atheism, eating away the spiritual life; Individualism,

charging the units of society with emotionalism and an obsession of self-expression, and Materialism, the composite expression of all of these."

I can understand the author's dislike for "flamboyant promises." That is a form of overstatement to which the advertising man is especially sensitive. But what I cannot understand is his dislike of democracy. Surely he does not want an aristocracy. It is democracy, and more democracy, that he should cry for. An aristocracy would not permit him to flourish so luxuriously. He would

wither in its affected atmosphere. Caste would be disdainful of him. Manorial estates would not yield to his sense of the pictorial. It is democracy, the democracy of Mr. Hearst, that is the true Paradise of flaunting headline and blithesome poster. Of all forms of social organization the advertising philosopher should have the kindest word for democracy, and the "purer" it is the better. For it is democracy that has made him a God.

S. N. BEHRMAN.

The Cycle of Revolution

A DISCUSSION of the psychology of revolution without considering its analogy to war must invite some confusion. For it will soon be found that any precise formulation of the psychological differences between war and revolution is a matter of considerable difficulty. Some differences are, of course, obvious enough. Revolution is infinitely more chaotic. It lacks that superficial aspect of discipline which makes war appear to be an ordered and rational procedure. Indeed it is this complete absence of the traditions and conventions of war which makes revolution so terrifying to the average historian and drives him into seeking an analogy in guerilla warfare rather than in the classic campaigns which he has been in the habit of glorifying as part of the progress of civilization. Yet war and revolution have in common that they both represent the complete denial of all that is civilized in life, for it is their essence to remove all the inhibitions which ordinarily cluster about property, hunger, and sex, and it is this similarity which is so puzzling from a purely psychological point of view.

The affinities between war and revolution are of special interest just now because both religious piety and ingrained respect for the ruling classes have ceased to exert a dominant influence upon the masses and can no longer be relied upon to act the part of arch pacifiers in which they used to be so successful. From now on it is at least likely that war will always be followed by revolution. It may spring equally from the discontent of the defeated and from the apparent justification of unrestraint which war brings to the victors especially when, as almost inevitably happens, the spoils of war are not evenly divided among all classes. From this last point of view the policy of inaugurating a war in order to calm impending discontent within the state would seem to be more shortsighted than ever.

If, nevertheless, I apparently call attention to the relation between war and revolution only to ignore it by proceeding to discuss revolution separately, this is due to the fact that in many ways revolution is a much simpler phenomenon. It is a much more spontaneous occurrence and its psychological aspects are therefore far more outstanding. It is less engineered, less manipulated than war. It is one of those things which apparently happens without anyone very consciously willing it, as is proved by the fact that even journalists hesitate to flatter their readers by holding up any particular individual to serve as the revolutionary scapegoat. Much more so than in the case of war, it seems to be acknowledged that revolution is the product of impersonal social forces.

At first sight it looks like a very confident procedure to try to predicate the course of anything so inchoate as revolution. Yet that is precisely what everybody immediately sets out to do, with an assurance which no one would dream of in foretelling the developments of a war. The revolution in Russia had hardly begun before everybody began to re-read his French Revolution in order to know what was coming. There seems to be a general assumption that there is something automatic about a revolution and that it moves in a definite cycle. It is from this point of view that I propose to examine it.

The revolutionary cycle may be stated somewhat baldly as follows. It begins with a sudden eruptive release of the inhibitions surrounding law and order and property, in the form of a seizure of state authority and of such commodities as food and arms. From there it rapidly proceeds to the abolition of all inhibitions in practically every sphere of public and private life. When this has been accomplished the revolution reaches its summit and then for a time remains stationary. The turn comes when a new set of inhibitions appear which gradually find general acceptance in place of the old ones. Society has then been reconstituted. For society rests upon inhibitions, whereas the absence of inhibitions means either revolution or the savagery which antedates all known forms of society. Revolution is the only savagery of which we have first hand knowledge.

Revolutions are usually preceded by demands for reform—land and tax reforms in the French Revolution, administrative and land reforms in Russia, and electoral reforms in Germany—which are of so mild a nature that they commend themselves even to the most conservative and would seem to contain no cause for alarm. They represent what is really a false front and conceal the true revolution behind what is apparently a mere reform movement. The real revolution can be detected only by a certain undertone which runs through the affected classes. This undertone expresses itself in the voicing of a number of high sounding ideals of a general humanitarian nature together with certain religious and millennial ideas. These are quite disproportionate to the specific reforms proposed and really have very little to do with them. Yet it is by studying these ideals that we learn the nature of the inhibitions under which society has been chafing and which it is now about to throw off.

For it must be borne in mind that an ideal, psychologically considered, is a state in which we are able to release a group of inhibitions without regard for our realistic environment. In the ideal of paradise, for instance, we think

of ourselves as going about naked because we have been relieved of the inhibitions of shame and of sex, we solve the problem of food without exerting ourselves, and we feel freed from all evil impulses because impulses are felt to be good or evil only in relation to inhibitions, all of which, fortunately, we have left behind us on earth. Our ideals always bear a direct relation to our deepest suppressions, a fact which goes far in explaining why ideals have a way of being the preliminaries to brutalities.

As we follow the successive steps of a revolution one of the first things which strikes us is that the radicals who are in being at the time almost immediately experience a conservative reaction. They want to put the brakes on the revolution as soon as their cherished reforms have been put into effect. They utterly fail to grasp that these reforms which hitherto have encountered the resistance of society are successfully put through now only because they are carried by the wave of a social convulsion which scorns all checks. These radicals represent a momentary stability of society because they are inhibited by the logic and the limitations of their goal, whereas the revolution knows no logic and acknowledges no limitations. They are unable to maintain themselves upon the quicksand which they vainly try to tread; they cannot, so to speak, step upon blood without slipping, which is a very poor thing for revolutionists to do. In short they become a kind of new middle class and their reaction would teach us, if history had not already done so, that revolution never springs from the middle classes, the so-called bourgeoisie. What at most the middle classes can achieve, as in 1848, is a reform movement attended with a certain amount of violence. They have too many vested interests to want a radical subversion of the existing government. They do not seek to abolish and usurp authority directly, but merely to present demands to it. It is a condition of their activity to keep the government in being, for they feel the threat of a lower and much more unstable stratum of society which is peculiarly susceptible to the contagion of violence.

As soon as these former radicals have been discredited the revolution sharply increases its pace and plainly becomes a progressive release of all restraints and inhibitions. The formula is simple. Any existing leader or group of leaders can be overthrown by those who propose some still more radical measure which promises a further release of inhibitions. The leaders in being must either acquiesce and thereby share and really loose their leadership, or else they must assume a conservative position and thus become exposed to the resentment of the mob which execrates them as the embodiment of those restraints which the mob is bent upon casting off. In revolution the mob is always the court of last appeal, and, little though we know about mob psychology, it is a matter of common observation that the mob is chronically inclined to prefer a radical proposal to a conservative one. To tell the mob to restrain itself and do nothing, is equivalent to asking it to disperse, and the astute leader knows that he can always form a new cohesion and impart fresh impetus to the mob by inciting it to further destructive action. The counsel of restraint can always be trumped by the counsel of excess. Thus the opening phases of revolution always present the spectacle of many rapid shifts of leadership with a progressive disorganization of the whole structure of existing society.

The more theoretical developments of revolution keep pace with these political upheavals. Thus new theories of religion and of sexual relations seem to be an integral part of all revolutionary movements. This is not at all surprising if we bear in mind that religion and some kind of sex

code are among the earliest social forms in which psychic inhibitions express themselves. The new forms which now take their place are characterized by a minimum of inhibitions: the religion of revolution is an ideal religion, that is, a religion without retribution, while the new sex code avoids the consequences of cohabitation or at least shifts them from the individual to society as a whole. Both these developments run parallel to the revolutionary economic theory in which toil is eliminated or ideally converted into play.

Yet it is entirely to the credit of revolution that man's deepest inhibition, the inhibition against killing, maintains itself longest. Revolutionary movements are always imbued with a spirit of altruism and universal brotherhood, the sincerity and depth of which it would be very unjust to doubt. Capital punishment is abolished and a general amnesty is granted, as if the revolution were striving by every means in its power to contrast itself with the tyranny against which it was invoked. Indeed one of the most precious contributions of revolutions is this new sense of the value of the individual. But as revolution necessarily encounters resistance from without and differences from within, a subtle transformation takes place which is further helped by the contagion to which the inhibition against killing is exposed by the general breakdown of inhibitions in every other sphere. The value of the individual begins to recede again in proportion as the ideals of the revolution are threatened. When these ideals become so exalted in the minds of the revolutionists that human life seems worthless by comparison, the inhibition against killing is finally swept away. History teaches us, not only through revolutions but through such things as the Crusades, the Inquisition and all "holy" wars, that humanity is usually at its worst when it begins to slay for the sake of an ideal.

The plea that revolutions would be idyllic if they were only left alone is beside the point. Short of a simultaneous world-wide revolution they will never be left alone. Every still civilized, that is, inhibited community in contact with revolution will resist it. To approve it would be to acquiesce in it, would mean to consent to a similar release of all inhibitions. Such a release is always contagious and it is to guard against this contagion that these communities pour out their wrath and condemnation. Their action is comprehensible even though they resort to every form of misrepresentation; it is certainly notable that the sympathy which any revolution may arouse usually comes from communities sufficiently far removed to be safe from the revolutionary contagion. What is perhaps more unreasonable is the extreme horror which revolutionary excesses evoke; for, after all, revolutions merely do in a concentrated way things which are often condoned by the historian as long as they are thinly spread over a century or two.* A bloodless revolution is really a contradiction in terms: real revolution always penetrates down to the deepest strata of inhibitions and must therefore necessarily arouse the fiercest resistance. In a society sufficiently elastic to accommodate itself without friction to such changes a revolutionary movement could never gain headway in the first place.

The revolutionary cycle as we have followed it thus far has now arrived at the stage where the revolution is "wide open": the lid is off the millennium. But the end is now also at hand. When revolutions have once reached the orgiastic stage they quickly run down. The French Revolution literally exhausted its ingenuity for killing. The

* Compare the reply of the Bolshevik government to the protest of the Allies against the alleged revolutionary excesses in Russia.

emotional labor involved in the release of inhibitions absorbs all available energy and finally produces a state very much akin to boredom. The ultimate revolutionist may be described as a man who goes about naked, wolfs his food, appropriates anything he covets, possesses every woman that strikes his fancy, and slays without hesitation. He is the completely uninhibited man. As such, however, he is quite unstable. Man as we know him seems to be incapable of ridding himself of an inhibition without immediately setting up another inhibition in its place. Just as the old society was destroyed by the release of inhibitions the new society can only be restored by establishing new inhibitions.

This constructive process has really been operative since the beginning of the revolutionary movement. The revolutionist policy of living from hand to mouth economically, combined with the constant threat from without, gradually forces the current of thought out of its ideal setting back into contact with the actualities. The purely circular movement of uninhibited impulses is replaced by directed thinking working towards a realistic goal. A new attitude towards law, property, religion and sex becomes expressed in a new series of inhibitions which spring up at the periphery and slowly work towards the centre of the revolution. It is the beginning of a compromise which from a theoretical point of view has many reactionary aspects, if only because in practice it is always supported by the aristocrats, capitalists, militarists, ecclesiasts, and what not, whom the revolution has driven out. But it is justified and gathers its strength as a function of the fundamental compromise between impulse and restraint which underlies all society. The revolution, despite itself, contributes to it, due to a man's inveterate habit of setting up a new inhibition in place of the one he rejects, upon which we have already commented, as when he repudiates a religion only to proclaim a new one or abolishes marriage only to conform to a new sexual code which merely does not go by the name of marriage. In proportion as the revolution slows up at the centre these new inhibitions bear down upon it until they finally overtake and destroy the ultimate revolutionist, much as hounds freshly thrown into the pack at last pull down the stag. This last phase of the revolution is really an act of social vengeance against the transgressors of inhibitions which are now again felt to be holy.

In trying to sum up the good and evil of revolution it is essential to distinguish between the conditions which lead to revolution and the so-called excesses of the revolution itself. It is a human failing to blame results when it is disagreeable to admit that we are implicated in the causes. If we succeed in emancipating ourselves from this fallacy we can the more freely admit that revolutions always contribute to the emancipation of the human spirit. Their temporary reversion to savagery frightens us unduly and impels us to judge them more harshly than wars, even though wars exhibit the same savagery without any guarantee of social progress. To come back to our analogy between war and revolution, we may say that wars display a much more wilful shuffling off of the restraints of civilization in the interest of some material gain with a far more deliberate indulgence of our innate anti-social instincts: revolutions, on the contrary, have an involuntary quality, with the poor and the oppressed helplessly swept into a bloody protest against intolerable wrongs, much as they are carried away by a revival which offers them a purely spiritual consolation for the riches and the privileges which they lack. What revolutions do accomplish is a new and a finer adjustment between men's inner emotional demands and the gratifications which the world in which they live

can offer: they make the struggle for existence a little more worthwhile again to the great submerged masses who are forever being trampled upon at the bottom of the pit called civilization.

It would be a somewhat pompous task and one exceeding the limits of this paper to attempt to define the place and function of revolutions in the general social progress. It may be that they are merely a kind of disturbing spurt in the otherwise calm lullaby of progress, but I do not feel sufficiently conversant with the leap frog theory of evolution to press the point. It is certainly ironical that just at the time when the French Revolution had really provided the basis of political freedom for the world, the advent of science and of industry should have perfected an industrial slavery which soon made the old political serfdom seem trivial by comparison. From this point of view the whole nineteenth century and all its wars may be looked upon as a preparation for the present revolution, which was already foreshadowed before the echoes of the French Revolution had subsided. And today, when the forces of reaction are apparently everywhere in the saddle again and only a few liberals voice a thin and hysterical protest, it is perhaps safer to confine ourselves to saying that thus far man has always been extraordinarily fertile in inventing oppressions and extraordinarily blind to their consequences.

ALFRED B. KUTTNER.

Some Day I Shall Be

Some day
I shall be
The carved frost,
The flung foam,
Or a shell of ivory—
Or a bat's wing,
Or a wasp's sting,
Or a gull in the hair of the sea.

Some day
I shall be
The gray mist,
The green moss,
Or pollen wed to a bee—
Or an owl's cry,
Or a fire fly,
Or a worm at the heart of a tree.

DAVID ROSENTHAL.

At Sunset

Sing! your hair against his cheek
As his life is over thine;
Hair of amber charged with fire
Shading eyes that burn as wine.
Sing ye not of yesterday,
Tales of gods nor chivalry,
Only sing of things that lie
Sleeping in life yet to be.
When the birds at last forget
To return at summer's call,
When the sun is dark and cold,
And the dew forgets to fall;
When the stars are scattered far,
Still be singing, if you can;
Whisper, in the final night
Proudly, "I have loved a man!"

EVELYN WELLS.

CORRESPONDENCE

A Bolshevik Apologist: Mr. Hard

SIR: In the New Republic, July 9th, Mr. William Hard devotes more than four pages to an attack upon my recent book, *Bolshevism*. To that attack I desire to reply. I must be brief since I cannot hope to have placed at any disposal as much space as Mr. Hard's essay occupied, greatly as I should enjoy the amusement of a detailed examination and exposure of that interesting literary production.

Like practically every other literary apologist of the Bolsheviks, Mr. Hard studiously misrepresents facts and motives, as I shall immediately show. He not only deliberately misstates my position—concerning which no one who can read English can be honestly mistaken—but he imputes to me motives and purposes for which there is not the least shadow of foundation in fact in anything I have ever written, said or done. For the necessity of making this statement I am very sorry.

For example, Mr. Hard, in his first paragraph, refers to my statement ("Bolshevism," page 199) with reference to the Kerensky coalition government, that "no other government was possible for Russia except a strong despotism." Concerning this statement and my treatment of subsequent developments he says: "Mr. Spargo's view is that Russia should have a despotism but that it should be a despotism organized democratically."

There is not one word in my book which can be honestly interpreted to mean that I ever held any such view. As any reader of the book can see, and as Mr. Hard knew perfectly well, my view was quite different. As reference to the book will show, my view was (as it still is, I may add) that the coalition government was not a despotism; that it was intelligently and efficiently building up a stable system of constitutional government; that it was the duty of every Socialist to support that government and to avoid the only alternative—despotism. My view was and is that to conspire against democracy and attempt any sort of despotism was, for Socialists and radicals, treason. Mr. Hard presumably read the chapter headed *The Bolshevik War Against Democracy*, to which he makes reference; that chapter is very largely given to the amplification of the views I have here expressed.

This exposure of Mr. Hard's method might very well stand as a sufficient comment upon his essay. Those who approve that method, who approve the citation of texts isolated from contexts in such a manner as to deceive and the studied misrepresentation of the views and opinions under discussion, will applaud Mr. Hard and will not be influenced by any further exposure of his controversial tricks. All others will need no further examination of Mr. Hard's competence as a witness.

Nevertheless, there are some other portions of Mr. Hard's essay which I desire to discuss. While not denying the correctness of my quotation of Lenin's declaration that the Bolsheviks proposed to impose upon 130,000,000 of Russian peasants the rule of 200,000 members of the Bolshevik party, Mr. Hard invokes certain other quotations from a well-known pamphlet by Lenin, written before the Bolshevik coup d'état, entitled *Can the Bolsheviks Hold the Government Power?* Mr. Hard quotes three paragraphs. He says:

In this pamphlet Lenin speaks of the well-known fact that in every country the *voters* of any political

party are many times more numerous than the party-members. He alludes to the evidence of this fact in elections recently held in Petrograd. On that evidence, after calculating the Bolshevik *party* strength as 240,000, he calculates the Bolshevik *voting* strength as 1,000,000; and he says: "Here we have already a State Apparatus of 1,000,000 faithful to the Socialist State."

He adds: "Not only this, but we have a method by which at one blow we can increase our State Apparatus ten-fold—a method which not a single capitalist state has ever had, or could ever have at its disposal, namely, the summoning of the laboring, the summoning of the poor, to the every-day work of managing the State."

He adds later: "To govern the State in such a spirit (the spirit of benefit for the mass) we can at once summon a Government Apparatus of 10,000,000, if not of 20,000,000 people; and this apparatus we, and we alone, can create; because we are assured of the most complete and unlimited sympathy by the gigantic majority of the population."

Mr. Hard proceeds to complain that in my book I did not quote the foregoing sentences as well as the one about the domination of Russia by the 200,000. I should be delighted to discuss these sentences comprehensively. It would be interesting to examine Lenin's estimate of the membership of the Bolshevik party. In the sentence I quoted he estimated that strength at 200,000. In the quotation given by Mr. Hard at 240,000. As a matter of fact the Bolshevik *party* never had a membership of one half of the lesser of these estimates. I have before me official reports of the party membership which amply sustain this statement. But whatever the party *membership*, and whatever the party *vote*, as a democrat and a Socialist I hold the following truths to be incontestable: (a) That however much the party *vote* may exceed the party *membership* the responsibility of those in political office must be to the *voters* and not to the party machine; (b) government must rest upon the will of the majority; (c) any attempt to overthrow the will of the majority as expressed in properly held elections (where these are based upon democratic, universal suffrage) is indefensible.

Mr. Hard throws a camouflage of verbiage over the one incontestable fact which is the basis of my indictment of Bolshevism, namely, that democratic, universal suffrage had been established and that under it 36,000,000 voters chose their representatives to formulate the sort of government they desired, whereupon, finding the majority against them, the Bolsheviks determined to destroy the Constituent Assembly and impose by brute force minority rule upon Russia.

It was quite impossible for me to quote everything said by Lenin: what I did quote was accurately quoted and fairly quoted, in no manner misrepresenting either the purpose or the policy of Lenin. In July, 1917, Lenin wrote that: "In a free country people are governed by those whom they elect for that purpose." He wrote, further: "*Only that authority will be stable at time of popular revolution which rests deliberately and unconditionally on the majority of the population.*" That was Lenin the Social Democrat. As a Social Democrat I accept unequivocally that position. But Lenin the counter-revolutionist repudiated that sound democratic doctrine.

Mr. Hard seizes upon my statement that "when they

came into power" the Bolsheviks "suppressed all non-Bolshevik papers" and then gives a list of papers which were being published six months later. Here, again Mr. Hard is playing the role of the journalistic cuttle-fish. Possibly the sentence he quotes is incorrect, taken by itself and without the other references to the same subject. It would have been more exact to say—what various passages in the book make perfectly clear—that the Bolsheviks on coming into power at once began to suppress non-Bolshevik papers, especially those belonging to other Socialist groups, and that later on they determined to suppress all non-Bolshevik papers. That they never did actually succeed in preventing the publication of other than Bolshevik papers is true, for the reason stated in my book, namely, that the old "underground" methods used under the Tsars were resorted to. I give in my book an account of this method published on the authority of the largest and oldest Socialist party in Russia.

If Mr. Hard wanted your readers to know the whole truth, he would have laid before them the facts concerning the "publication" of opposition papers under Bolshevik rule. Does he know the story of the *Vsieгда Vperiod*? Or that of the Socialist-Revolutionist *Dyelo Naroda*. I have that story, in part, at least, from a very competent authority—L. Martov.

I am greatly interested to observe the ease with which Mr. Hard can find excuse and justification for the suppression of unfriendly papers by the Bolsheviks. If his logic is good as applied to the Russian situation, the suppression of all anti-war papers during the war by our government would have been justified; and certainly the present suppression of every I. W. W. and Bolshevik journal in the United States could be justified by the application of the same reasoning.

Mr. Hard is greatly wrought up because I do not quote the editorial comment and headline upon a despatch giving an account of public capital punishment. There was not the slightest reason why I should have quoted the editorial comment of *Izvestia*; every word of the despatch itself was quoted. Moreover, I took the pains to have the translation (which I took from Bolshevik sources, in its present form, minus headline and comment, exactly as I have printed it) carefully verified.

Certainly, as Mr. Hard himself shows, the picture of terrorism given in the paragraph cannot be said to exaggerate the ruthlessness of the Bolsheviks toward their political opponents. Its quotation did not the slightest injustice. Mr. Hard justifies that ruthlessness. I presume, in consequence of what he has written, that he would justify the infamous Order No. 903, which is as bad as anything in history.

What Mr. Hard carefully conceals from the reader is the fact that the public execution described in the despatch above referred to was an *official act*. It was the working of the Soviet. The tribunal was set up by the Soviet. It was by no means an isolated example. Moreover, as Mr. Hard knows, or ought to know if he does not, while the central Bolshevik government possessed no right to repeal such sentences, it has again and again suppressed local Soviets which have not been "ruthless" enough in enforcing capital punishment. He knows, or ought to know, that Extraordinary Revolutionary Tribunals were set up, authorized to go into any community, condemn men and women to death and see them executed, there being no appeal of any kind from their decision.

Just as he began with a studied misstatement of my views, so Mr. Hard ends with a misrepresentation of my

views and purposes. By innuendo it is made to appear that I have attempted to create sentiment for intervention in Russia to the end that one set of dictators may be replaced by another. In truth I have never favored intervention in Russia. I have favored the withdrawal of our forces from Russia. On the other hand, I have consistently opposed the recognition of the Bolsheviks or any other government in Russia, by the government of the United States, not based upon the freely expressed will of the Russian people through a Constituent Assembly.

My book was written for and addressed to my fellow citizens in America. It was not written to or for the people of Russia or expected to influence them. It was written because I, as a Socialist and Internationalist, loyal to the principles and precepts of historic Socialism, felt it incumbent upon me to combat the mushy-minded apologists of Bolshevism, both within and without the Socialist ranks. In writing it I took very little notice of the immense accumulation of well-attested evidence of unspeakable atrocities, preferring to set forth the dangerous and reactionary character of Bolshevik theories and policies. Wherever I made reference to acts of brutality it was for the obvious purpose of illustrating my contention that Bolshevism is not progressive but reactionary.

It is no part of my task to defend Admiral Kolchak. Resting upon the advice of Russian Socialists of many years standing, men I have long known and honored, who have been honored by Socialists everywhere during a long period, I have opinions quite other than those which Mr. Hard has seen fit to adopt. I should welcome the opportunity to set forth in *The New Republic* why, in my judgment, its attacks upon Kolchak should cease.

I am sorry to find Mr. Hard placing his good gifts at the service of so poor a cause, but if he feels that he must continue to do so he hardly needs to resort to the expedients of text-twisting, verbal quibbling and misstatement.

JOHN SPARGO.

Old Bennington, Vermont.

Mr. Hard Replies

SIR: Mr. Spargo's letter makes five points. One of them I admit, and four of them I altogether deny.

I will begin with the three points having to do with Russian fact. The first of these is about the rule of the 200,000.

Mr. Spargo says that it was quite impossible for him to quote everything said by Lenin. He, therefore, in his book, quoted Lenin's remark about the rule of the 200,000 and did not quote Lenin's remark about the state-apparatus of the 10,000,000 or 20,000,000. I can show him how he could have found room for that latter remark. He mentions the 200,000 twice, once on page 155 and once on page 211. He could have given one of those two places to the 10,000,000 or 20,000,000.

Mr. Spargo says that the 10,000,000 or 20,000,000 were mentioned by Lenin in a "well-known" pamphlet. He thus implies that he was familiar with the pamphlet. He thus further implies that his failure to quote from it was intentional.

But that was the whole of my charge—and more than the whole. I did not charge intention. I charged only result. I said that Mr. Spargo misquoted Lenin, enormously, by partially non-quoting him. Well, he did. His further observations, about the statistics of the membership of the Bolshevik party, and about the Constituent

Assembly, and about the indefensibility of overthrowing the will of the majority—what have they to do with my charge? I said myself that Lenin is anti-democratic. And every American is anti-Democratic who concurs in preventing Negroes from voting. And there are millions of such Americans. The question is: what is the *measure* of Lenin's anti-democracy? Mr. Spargo gave a fantastically false measure of it, in its political intention, by not quoting Lenin adequately. His point now seems to be that he can purge himself by saying that Lenin is an anti-democrat anyway. I deny that he can.

Mr. Spargo's next point of Russian fact is about newspapers. He says now that the Bolsheviks "never did actually succeed in preventing the publication of other than Bolshevik papers," but he wants to know why I do not tell the story of *Vsiegda Vperiod* and the story of *Dyelo Naroda*, and he says that the reason why the Bolsheviks did not actually succeed in preventing the publication of non-Bolshevik papers was that "the old 'underground' methods used under the Tsars were resorted to." In reply I can inform Mr. Spargo that all the non-Bolshevik papers I mentioned as being published in Moscow in May of 1918, six months after the Bolshevik revolution, were delivered to friends of mine openly at their hotel or bought by them publicly at news-stands. As for *Dyelo Naroda*, Mr. Spargo himself, in his own book, on page 221, shows that it kept on coming out, in the pre-civil-war period, "only changing its name." As for *Vsiegda Vperiod*, it was coming out in February of this very year; and Mr. Spargo will be interested to know that in its issue of February 15th of this year it remarked that in Siberia, under Kolchak, whom Mr. Spargo does not wish attacked, the Menshevik party organizations, though anti-Bolshevik, are "nearly everywhere driven underground." I admitted that the Bolsheviks suppressed newspapers. I denied that in the pre-civil period their suppressions were sufficient to dry up the flow of strong opposition criticism. I still deny it, and Mr. Spargo brings forward no facts to disprove my denial.

But Mr. Spargo says that if I "find excuse" for suppressions of "unfriendly" papers by the Bolsheviks, I am justifying the suppressions of American anti-war papers by the American government during our late war with Germany. What I said in my article was that in a civil war no government will permit the publication of pro-enemy (that is, rebel) papers. The typical anti-war paper in America during our late war was not in the slightest degree engaged in fomenting any armed rebellion against the United States government. In my article I excused Kerensky for raiding the paper and wrecking the printshop of those self-confessed prospective rebels, the Bolsheviks. In July of 1918 the Bolsheviks, after the manner of Oliver Cromwell and George Washington, had ceased, by successful force, to be rebels and had become the government. I say that no government, whatever its origin and whatever its leadership, Kerensky's or Lenin's or Mr. Spargo's, will ever willingly tolerate the existence of newspapers or magazines dedicated to its physical destruction. If Mr. Spargo says that I therefore justify the suppression of a newspaper for urging its government not to continue a certain foreign war, I earnestly dissent. I do not see it.

Mr. Spargo's third point of Russian fact is about the flogging and hanging at Loupia, as narrated in *Izvestia*. Mr. Spargo says there is no reason why he should have quoted the headline to the article in *Izvestia*. I repeat

the reason to him. He claimed that the Bolsheviks had "introduced hanging and flogging in public for petty civil crimes." He proved this claim—and it was his only proof—by the article in *Izvestia*. But the headline—"A Night-mare"—showed that the official paper of the Soviet government disapproved of the hanging and flogging at Loupia. The introductory sentence displayed a similar disapproval. So did the editorial comment—a disapproval strong and uncompromising. This editorial comment was not separate from the article. It was embedded within the article. The reason why Mr. Spargo should have quoted the headline and the introductory sentence and the editorial comment was because in that way he could have made progress toward the essential aim of his book, which, in his book's preface, is this: "a fair and reliable statement of the philosophy, programme and policies of the Russian Bolsheviks."

But Mr. Spargo says that I myself, in my article, show that the "terrorism" at Loupia "cannot be said to exaggerate the ruthlessness of the Bolsheviks toward their political opponents." Mr. Spargo has gravely misunderstood me. I said: "Why cannot Mr. Spargo content himself with the executions actually ordered and actually accomplished by the Bolshevik government?" I then gave instances of executions. But I did not say that those executions were floggings. I did not say that they were torturings. Mr. Spargo seems to imply that in admitting official executions I admitted ruthless bestiality of method in official executions. I really did not. Mr. Spargo, if he will re-read my sentence, will see that he misunderstood it.

But Mr. Spargo finally, in this matter of Loupia, has a third line of defence. He says that I carefully conceal from the reader the fact that the hanging and flogging was an "official act," by "the Soviet." I will now reprint, just as in my article I reprinted, the precise text of the story of the affair at Loupia, precisely and completely as given in Mr. Spargo's book.

Two village robbers were condemned to death. All the people of *Semenovskaia* and the surrounding communes were invited to the ceremony. On July 6th, at midday, a great crowd of interested spectators arrived at the village of Loupia. The organizers of the execution gave to each of the bystanders the opportunity of flogging the condemned to obtain from them supplementary confessions. The number of blows was unlimited. Then a vote of the spectators was taken as to the method of execution. The majority was for hanging. In order that the spectacle could be easily seen, the spectators were ranged in three ranks—the first row sat down, the second rested on the knee, and the third stood up.

That is the story. But where is the Soviet in it? I have looked and looked and looked. This Soviet does not come out for me. I am not concealing it. I never found it. If Mr. Spargo ever found it, he has gone and lost it, and it was a valuable Soviet to him. But there is only one place where it could have been. And I have re-printed that place. And I ask the readers: is it there?

I say it is not; and I deny that Mr. Spargo has made any answer whatsoever to my charge that he discovered a Bolshevik policy of "hanging and flogging for petty civil crimes" by discovering one story of a hanging and flogging and by then eliminating from that story three certain parts which prove that the hanging and flogging in question was not an official execution at all but merely a lawless lynching—and furthermore a lynching that was

reprobated with horror by the Bolshevik official paper reporting it.

Mr. Spargo's two remaining points have to do with opinion. The first of these is about despotism in Russia.

Mr. Spargo says that I misrepresented his sentence: "No other government was possible for Russia except a strong despotism." I did. I have looked at that sentence again in his book and I find that I did misrepresent it. Mr. Spargo says that I misrepresented it deliberately. He over-estimates my appetite for punishment. I knew that Mr. Spargo was a living author and that he could still lift a pen. I was not anxious to put myself into a position in which I would be sure to be knocked down. In this position I am knocked down flat. I admit the blow and the fault that deserved the blow. I got Mr. Spargo's sentence entirely wrong. Mr. Spargo did not mean, and he did not say, that *no* government was possible for Russia except a strong despotism. He meant, and he said, that no *other* government was possible for Russia except a strong despotism—*other*, that is, as the context shows, than a government like the Kerensky government. I have to apologize and I have to retract. I do so. I grossly misunderstood his sentence and I grossly misrepresented his opinion about despotism in Russia. Mr. Spargo does not believe in despotism for Russia. He believes in democratic constitutionalism for Russia.

Mr. Spargo's fifth and last point is that I have misinterpreted his book in its relation to intervention. This I do not admit. This I deny—positively.

In his letter, to be sure, Mr. Spargo takes a personal stand against intervention. But even in his letter he at once brings that stand to a standstill by saying that the New Republic's attacks on Kolchak should cease. To cease attacking Kolchak is to cease attacking intervention itself.

Colonel Lebedev—the same Colonel Lebedev who fought among the first fighters against Lenin—has recently described the identity between Kolchak and intervention. Colonel Lebedev went to see General Knox—the representative of the British power in Siberia. He went to see him on behalf of the Government of Members of the Constituent Assembly. The Kolchak government did not then exist. Colonel Lebedev went to see General Knox on behalf of the existing Government of Members of the Constituent Assembly, existing first at Ufa and then at Omsk. General Knox discussed the Members of the Constituent Assembly with Colonel Lebedev and said: "I have no confidence in those people." He wanted Kolchak. He created Kolchak. Colonel Lebedev divulges and authenticates, the full suspected truth. The Government of Members of the Constituent Assembly was destroyed and the coup d'etat which made Kolchak Supreme Governor was successfully enacted—thanks to what? "Thanks to the direct and open support," says Colonel Lebedev, "of General Knox."

Mr. Spargo is a great attacker of the Bolshevik coup d'etat at Petrograd. He is no attacker at all of the anti-Bolshevik interventionists coup d'etat at Omsk. His letter is a true continuation of his book. I did not say that his book defends intervention. I said that it promotes intervention. It does. It does it, as I said, by rousing us to fury against the sins of the Bolsheviks and by not rousing us to any fury whatsoever against the sins of the anti-Bolsheviks; because the sins of the anti-Bolsheviks are not mentioned. The interventionists at once know this book for what it is. They adore it. They puff it and

push it. The official interventionist organ, *Struggling Russia*, calls it a "splendid book." Mr. Spargo becomes the anti-Bolshevik laureate of interventionist circles. Then he writes a letter in which he opposes intervention but opposes attacks on intervention's personal practical embodiment. I deny that I misrepresented him. On the contrary, I claim that the greatest written influence inclining the minds of Americans toward intervention in Russia—toward foreign armed coercive philanthropy among the countrymen of Metchnikov and Tolstoi, as if they were a "lesser breed without the law"—comes not from any singer of Toryism among us but from John Spargo, Socialist, Internationalist.

WILLIAM HARD.

Washington, D. C.

P.S.—He is grinding corn for the Philistines but surely some day he will wake up and remember that the war is over and his home is not in Gath.

The Passing of the Interurbans

SIR: The companies that financed stage coaches in the days when steam railroads put them out of business, must have died game. At any rate, they have left no record in history of overmuch squealing, nor do they seem to have appealed to governments to lengthen their sunset days by means that would increase the burden the majority bore. Yet, when one considers, there must have been some wide-spread changes. Holders of turnpike stock (it paid 6 per cent and was considered a good investment) livery men, horse raisers and dealers, farriers, coachmen, wheel-wrights, coach builders, harness makers, toll gate men, hostlers must have been affected.

Today the interurban electric lines, and some short steam railroads are in much the same position that horse transportation companies were in then. They are being pushed aside in great measure, by the automobile and the truck in rural communities. These more mobile means of transportation are rapidly finding favor.

An examination of electric railroad statistics of passengers carried, reveals the fact that, with war service eliminated, the past six years have shown a steady decrease in the number of revenue passengers carried. Many railroads, during the past two years, both electric and steam, because of this, have surrendered their charters and ceased operation. Some of them have been dismantled. In Ohio, the state from which this is written, at least eight roads have vanished from the map, and others must follow. Nor does it seem that the communities which these roads served have suffered. Where small villages have been left railroadless, auto bus lines have been established. The old right of way has been repurchased by the original owners, or by his successors at rates much below that paid for the land by the railroad at the time of construction, and has been brought into cultivation.

Obviously then, to attempt to persuade those in Washington that the plight of the interurbans can be bettered by an increase of rates, is foolish. Such an increase would only serve still further to decrease patronage, and exacerbate the troubles complained of, by driving still more people to the automobile and truck.

The probable outcome will be that the clumsy and insufficient mode of interurban and electric transportation will be replaced by the more serviceable automobile, with its cousin, the auto truck. Such interurbans as operate

between cities of considerable population will survive, but even they cannot, without ultimate disaster, raise their rates to any appreciable extent. Their hope is in economy, but not that false economy that makes for inferior maintenance. To be explicit and specific they could cultivate right of way land. This varies in width roughly from thirty to one hundred feet, and much of it is capable of cultivation. Offered at a low rate to the land hungry, or to the road laborers, it would easily find occupants. Revenue could be increased by selling electric current to farmers along the right of way. Old ties and bridge timbers, poles and posts, could be sold for fire wood, instead of being burned. Finally, and this is the greatest of all, bond holders, who in small interurbans, are more often than not the owners, should voluntarily reduce their holdings, and thus lengthen the burden of interest payments.

CHARLES J. FINGER.

Should We Punish the Guilty?

SIR: In listing the forces whose resultant is the Treaty of Versailles, you set down "three moral ideas" of which the first is "the righteousness of immeasurable punishment for immeasurable guilt."

To be sure you say this only for the sake of pointing out that the two other ideas must override this. But I protest against your counting this as a legitimate moral idea at all. It puts you on the reactionary side of all our internal questions of penal law.

Every law that punishes a man on account of the wickedness of his action is an evil. It tends to degrade the legislator, the judge, the executioner, and the public that backs the three; it reduces them toward the level of the criminal. So far as any of our laws or customs aim to make the penalty fit the crime they are among the disgraces of our legal system. If we did not shrink from consistently carrying out this impulse we should have to repeal the constitutional provision against cruel and unusual punishments; for there are many offenses, and some not now cognizable by the courts at all, that cannot be punished as they deserve while that provision stands.

Nor does the idea of punishing according to desert operate only to make us too harsh. At the same time it makes us too gentle. With our increasing knowledge of psychopathy comes an increasing recognition of the difficulty of asserting moral responsibility in the case of a large number of criminals; and our unintelligent law says, if when he did the act his brain was in such a state that he did not know it was wrong, let him go unless you can put him in an asylum. So we let them go.

We need to recognize that Tolstoi is absolutely right in condemning as devilish every penalty that aims to express our abhorrence of wickedness. We need to feel that the only justification for any penalty is its utility for deterrent, restraining, or reformatory purposes. Then, so far as we think it worth while to punish (for punishment in general is psychically very expensive), we need to apply this principle of utility consistently. Often the mental defective who is morally irresponsible is the very person to whom a penalty can most usefully be applied; nor should we forget that it may be legitimate to punish an insane person, for instance, Czolgosz, McKinley's assassin, merely for the deterrent effect which the punishment will have on persons not similarly insane.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

Ballard Vale, Massachusetts.

The Only Relief in Sight

SIR: We are not now to have a satisfactory League of Nations, but we shall have a League for the same reason that we have a Constitution of the states. The people know that without it we are nearer anarchy.

No League with or without Article X can make our people do in Europe what at any time they may not want to do, and their present judgments may not agree with their future judgments. But, regardless of opinions now or hereafter, the League offers the only chance for escape from intolerable discord; the only hope for peace and the only means for a gradual approach to international comity.

Reactionary objections are prompted by the knowledge that the League will interfere with the privileges of a cultivated nationalism. The Progressive objection that it is not as just as it might be, is countered by the common sense of the masses, who perceive that it is the only relief in sight and that if accepted it can be bettered by the same force of opinion which now compels its adoption.

Instead of opposing its adoption, should it not rather be our present duty to seek to correct its initial crudities by bringing Germany in quickly; by getting out of Russia; by backing up China and by financing Europe?

New York City.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Congratulations

SIR: I have noticed your continued interest in the negro problem—an interest nearly always more sincere than wise. Perhaps you would like to see the way a Southern sheriff should act under the threat of mob violence.

The following letter, published in the Greenville Democrat, is from the sheriff of Washington County, Mississippi, and was occasioned by the reversal of a conviction of a negro murderer whose crime had aroused the community:

To the People of Washington County, Mississippi:

It is reported that the case of Anthony Williams vs. State has been reversed by the Supreme Court of the State and it will come back to the circuit court of this county for a new trial.

I have been asked by the Governor of the state if I wished to remove Williams from the county for safe keeping or if I desired assistance from him in the protection of him. I have replied that I did not wish to remove the negro and that I needed no outside help to protect him. While I appreciate the motives of humanity on the part of the Governor which inspired his action, I would have considered the adoption of either course a reflection upon the citizenship of Washington County, indicating that such citizenship contemplated lawless mob violence and murder; I would further consider it a reflection upon myself as a sworn officer charged with the duty of upholding the law, indicating that I was either unable or unwilling to do my duty. Washington county, in my opinion, represents the best citizenship of the South, the kind of citizenship which governs by law, not by murder. With absolute confidence I appeal to that citizenship to render obedience to the laws which it has created and with the enforcement of which it is charged and upon which rests our civilization.

No friends of mine, and I count the citizens of Washington county my friends, will attempt to take a prisoner out of my hands, and no man who is not a friend of mine and of law and order can do it.

GEO. B. ALEXANDER,

Sheriff.

W. A. PERCY.

Greenville, Mississippi.

After the Play

IF the ordinary dramatist were to put into three dimensions that socialism and Bolshevism and mob rule which all the essayists and paragraphers are writing about, how would he begin? Mr. Thomas Dixon, in the new play that came to the 39th Street Theatre on Wednesday, begins in an island off the coast of California. John Duncan, a young idealist, has founded a colony there "to prove to the world an ideal of social democracy." The Red Dawn is the story of his experiment.

Duncan is perhaps a socialist of the Moderate Right. It was he who bought the island, and accordingly it is he who has become leader of the colony. But like Kerensky he is a leader in title only. The driving force of the malcontents has its source in Richard Stanton. And Stanton, not Duncan, is the protagonist of the play. Idealized by his wife and little daughter, Stanton remains an impersonal figure—a stronger man than Duncan—frank, determined, unscrupulous.

The Red Dawn opens quietly. A socialist colony is spread before us. There is nothing out of the ordinary. People come and go. Life is just about what readers of the National Civic Federation Review might expect it to be in any average community under socialist control. There is discontent, some starvation, a good deal of violence—distrust, misery, mutiny, suspicion and rioting. It is just the average socialist assembly of the Civic Federation brought to life for us. Nothing very much out of the way happens until there arrives in the island a delegate from the Central Soviet of Northern Europe.

This delegate is a sinister figure. And with his North European principles he precipitates a crisis which is already brewing and which threatens to split the socialist council into factions. In a word the question is one of self-determination: Shall four dancing girls be permitted, despite minority objection in the colony, to perform their tropical dances in whatever costumes they please? Duncan disapproves. But Stanton, speaking for the Left Wingers, declares that no people must be forced under a sovereignty that is not of their own choosing. "The first law of socialism," he says, "is that the end justifies the means." In fact he sees in the crisis a chance for his own gain. Of the dancing girls he will make an issue, flatly challenge the rule of Duncan in the colony. With several conspirators, he begins to lay plans. The premiere danseuse is exalted by the outlook. Throwing herself into Stanton's arms she cries: "Kiss me once, chief, then kill me if you like!"

Stanton does not kill her. It is twilight in the island. News of the approaching carnival has reached the colony. A crowd is gathering. Lanterns are hung in the garden. And accompanied by ukelele players oblivious of the role they are about to play in this test of political principle, the four dancing girls assemble.

At first only three of them begin their dances. Vera, the premiere, holds out. But as the ukeleles rise and the crowd hoots excitedly, she leaps to the center of the ring. Wild as Bedlam is the scene when Duncan arrives. He is angry, and disillusioned. He means, obviously, to assert his authority. But he is accompanied only by a single friend—and it is apparent that the hour has come for the Left Wing to strike. It comes in a flash. The dance is stopped—guns are drawn—there is a cry from the crowd—a brief show of resistance on the part of Duncan's companion—but it is over in a moment. A bloodless revolution—the king is dead, long live the king.

Stanton: "Now the red flower blooms tonight!"

Four Dancing Girls: "Hooray, hooray!"

Stanton: "Now for the Red Republic!"

Four Dancing Girls: "Hooray, hooray!"

But Duncan does not flinch. As the curtain prepares to fall he faces his captors: "I have just come back from France. This sort of thing can be done in Hungary and Russia. We'll see if it can be done with the brand of men who marched with Pershing!"

This ends the second act; but more disillusionment is coming. Stanton, now supreme in command, gives us a demonstration of how genuine socialism works in practice. The new church he promptly turns into a stable. His cook, a servant of long standing, he sends to the stockade for her studied impoliteness. Cargin, a lieutenant, he sends to the same place for insubordination. And when the principal dancing girl complains that Cargin has been shot en route to jail, Stanton tells his Red Guards: "The first law of the Red Republic is the levelling of intelligences. Take her to the stockade!"

Next is brought from his prison room Duncan, the idealist. And mercilessly Stanton shows the deposed leader where his parlor socialism has brought him. "We are going to overthrow the government of the United States," he says. Duncan is at first incredulous. But Stanton marshals facts for him. England is in disorder. "France may run with blood tomorrow." Italy is dancing on the edge of a volcano. Soviet troops will march into Texas from Mexico. Every newspaper office in the country will be blown up. Workmen's councils are already organized to take over the railways. There are five thousand centers of I. W. W. propaganda. The negroes, "crazed with the denial of equality, are rioting even as we talk." From the workmen who think they can live like millionaires will come the big army. But Duncan will have none of it. "These United States are the greatest model of liberty in the world—and I stand for them." "Take him to the stockade," says Stanton.

Socialism, unmistakably, is overreaching itself. There is doom impending. Only long enough for a final challenge from husband to wife does it now hold off. For Stanton, until the time disaster itself is facing him, has neglected what should have come before, has never effected a nationalization of men and women. "Those irrational names—husband, wife, children—shall be heard no more," he tells his wife. "Here in our quiet little home the family must be destroyed if socialism is to live. . . . We must separate tonight." The child is to go to the state nursery. The wife? "Take her to the stockade."

She goes—stopping only to address the Red Guard who chances to befriend her: "You may be an ex-convict, Simpson, but beside the man who has just left this room you are a prince." She goes—but it is in an incredibly short time that she returns. Not alone. She has aligned herself with a corps of counter-revolutionaries on their way to deal with Stanton. And crisis finds the Left Wing unprepared. The rebels force their way indoors. There is tumult. Caught in the trap, faced with his accusing wife, and with Duncan, also released from prison, Stanton threatens suicide. But Simpson, the ex-convict, intervenes. It is the denouement. "Who are you?" demands Stanton. "Just a humble agent of our secret service office in Washington"—and as the curtain falls Simpson, no longer the ex-convict, takes from his coat-lapel the red bud of revolution and hoists in its place the bright badge of public detective.

C. M.

A Great Churchman

Hopes for English Religion, by J. Neville Figgis. New York: Longmans Green.

THOSE who are at all closely acquainted with Dr. Figgis's writings will think with poignant regret that this is the last of his books they will ever see. The regret will be the deeper when they lay it down, for it is at all points instinct with what was best and most characteristic in his work. Here, as always, there are the sense of great learning lightly borne, a deep love of freedom, a religious insight which commands the respect even of a dissenter from all faiths, an understanding of corporate personality more rich and fruitful than in any man since Acton, a fierce hatred of inequalities of social life. It is as yet too early to assess the debt we owe to Figgis; but if one had to name a volume that would make a stranger realize at a glance some of the qualities that made him the greatest churchman of his generation, it is to this book one would send him.

Figgis was so many-sided a man that it is difficult for any one less diverse to do him justice. It was easy to love him as soon as one saw the big, jovial figure and heard the ceaseless flow of brilliant talk, ending always with some startling paradox that left him chuckling as you pondered it. He was a Cambridge man—perhaps the most brilliant of that group which drew its inspiration from the inexhaustible fountain of Lord Acton's learning. He was at one of the smaller Cambridge colleges; and this, I suppose, must mainly explain why he was not kept for learning from the outset of his career. For his *Divine Right of Kings*, published when he had barely graduated, was proof and to spare that a new and powerful mind had come to debate the problems of historical politics. Thenceforward his life was an endless ecclesiastic vigil, with intervals of preaching, and one happy occasion when Trinity College made him (in 1900) its Birkbeck lecturer; an occasion to which we owe his *From Gerson to Grotius*, incomparably the best of his books, and, in many ways, perhaps the best study by any Englishman in the history of political ideas. Three lectures there were also on Bossuet, before Oxford University, in which, for one hearer at least, he seemed able, without effort, to call to his command resources of scholarship such as none save Gierke can in that field have possessed. He wrote to me in the autumn of 1916 that he was laboring to complete them; but I fear they are too incomplete ever to see the light. The kind of thesis they would have contained can be gleaned from his *Churches in the Modern State*, a book of decisive import for all students of the state. Let me add that he won the affection of men so diverse as Acton and Maitland; that no student ever went to him for guidance, and returned empty-handed; that in his personal life he was a saint without thought of self; and those who did not know him may envisage some measure of the man. It may perhaps be added that Figgis was twice in America—once at Harvard, and once in the Middle West. I have his own warrant for saying he did not leave this country friendless.

Figgis's work was in some sort a continuation of Lord Acton's. He was above all interested in the problem of freedom, and his main effort was to discover the condition of its attainment. He came to the problem, I think, mainly from an acute dislike of the situation occupied by the Church of England relative to the state. He felt

that her special ethos was destroyed by the expediency involved in the political connection. Thereby he was convinced of the unsatisfactory character of Erastian doctrine, but twenty-five years ago, he was still an Austinian, and the means of escape from the cobwebs of that nightmare he did not see until Maitland told him that in Gierke's magistral book he would find the secret of political freedom. Therein he discovered that the state is not the apotheosis of society, but merely one of the ways in which human beings happen to group themselves. He saw that it had a history, and that its sovereign character is, at bottom, no more than an accidental legacy of Reformation conditions. The state, in fact, was merely one of a class, societies, and morally entitled to no preeminence save that which it could win by the ethical character of its performance. Herein it was that he was able to find the solution of the problem of allegiance. For if the best of political action was its moral substance it followed that men's business was to weigh the claims of competing groups; and the effort of their conscience thus became the seat of political judgment. And, more and more, as years went by, Figgis became dissatisfied with the inert way in which the claims of the state received credit from the mass of men. The trade union movement was for him far more the representative of economic, the churches of moral, right than the purely political society. He came largely to disbelieve in the state as the general representative of the community. The consequence of that doctrine seemed to him on all sides oppressiveness. Men and their fellowships were swallowed up in the great Leviathan. Individuality was sacrificed to uniformity of outlook; and the child of uniformity was a soulless inertia.

Not, indeed, that liberty meant for Figgis no more than the assertion of individuality. Tolerant as he was, he knew that men mainly exert their influence through their fellowships; and nothing made him more genuinely angry than one who attempted to deny the ethos of a church and yet remain a member of it. The root of fellowship, as he saw, was in the continuity of its tradition; but a church without dogma, insofar as it claimed to be Christian, was building upon foundations of sand. Here he was true to a great medieval tradition; and, in a way, no insight of Figgis was more penetrating than his perception that the great evil of the Reformation was its destruction of the common moral authority of civilization without being able to discover its substitute. Not that he ever looked back with regret to Roman supremacy. Nothing seemed to him a more complete defiance of the moral impulses than the papalism of the Roman Church. But while he utterly condemned it the straiter Protestant sects seemed to him in not less danger of erecting each individual into a sovereign over the whole universe.

Here is the essence, in fact, of his teaching; and it explains his passionate affection for the English Church. His whole work was a protest against the legal theory of sovereignty, as politically unwise and morally inadequate. He liked the English Church because, as he deemed, it steered midway between the excesses of papalism, on the one hand, and of Quakerism with its inner light upon the other. There was room within its confines for men so diverse as Burnet and Law. He was proud of its great tradition of learning—of Lightfoot and Wescott and Hort, of Creighton and Stubbs and Overton. The figures, indeed, upon whom he dwelt with deepest feeling were hardly Anglicans in the common acceptance—men like Newman in one age and Tyrrell in the next. But

the Newman he revered was the Newman of the famous letter to the Duke of Norfolk, and his Tyrrell was the Tyrrell of that flaming protest against the autocracy of Rome. Never a Modernist himself, and not, as I think, appreciating at its proper worth, the bearing of biblical scholarship in the last two decades, his fine historic sense never let him lose his hold of the perception that the Church must grow, that the dogmas of one age are the heterodoxies of its successor. What alone made him angry was when some party in the Church claimed for its own interpretation the sense of the whole body. Fellowship meant for him so essentially the blending of diverse colors into a great harmony that attempt at persecution seemed to him the worst of crimes. Yet, at the same time he was impatient of the man who seeks to remain a Christian while, like Bishop Hoadly, he regards a priest as but a layman with a crook in his hand.

When one remembers the conditions under which he worked, the depth of his scholarship was a remarkable achievement. He had himself few books, partly because he had little or no money of his own, partly because the missionary character of his life made settled abode too difficult; and the great library was, as he said, the occasional boon of a fleeting holiday. Yet within the field he had made his own, I doubt if there are three men living who knew the texts as he did. One had only to see the ease with which he made his way about the great compendium of Goldast, the facility with which he hewed his path through the endless bye-ways of Suarez, his intimate knowledge of the lesser men like Soto and Zabarella and Charles Leslie, to realize how much of solid learning there was behind the modest opinions he uttered. Himself he always depreciated his scholarship, regretting the abyss that yawned between his own and Acton's knowledge. Yet I doubt if any of the great master's pupils had so nobly continued his work. To that unwritten history of liberty, we must add an unwritten history of the problem of church and state. But the historian who one day sees how the Gerson to Grotius has hewed a path through trackless regions will not think that Figgis lived in vain.

H. J. L.

Herbert Trench's Poems

Poems, by Herbert Trench. Two vols. London: Constable.

Art in haste? Self-sure? Wholly rational?

Pass by. This book hath nothing in thy vein.

The brief verse fashioned for a pedestal,

Not for thy footstool, may no less remain.

What though I fail, and the pedestal be bare,

Ye who have known the God will place him there.

THESE lines on the title page presage the reader's reactions with a rare understanding. To those who have "known the God" the verse at its best will conjure up early moods, when the emotions were first responding to the common gestures of beauty, and when snatches of Keats and Swinburne and Shelley, and music and garbled legends were blent in the mind like colors run together. But though one may catch the music of ghostly pipes their power is spent. One is under no compulsion to listen.

Fifty-four pages are over-run with the narrative poem *Deirdre*. Though published, according to notes, before the plays of Synge and Yeats, it would seem that the old tale

had yielded up most of its sweets before Mr. Trench reached it. Here and there lines bloom out of the waste:

—bleats shivering out

Like wool from thorns—

and

Souls like granite candles of a king

Flaming unshook.

But here too are such bedraggled rag-babies as:

Thanks piteous Gods, that no foreboding gave:

Apollo and the Seaman opens with a certain facile charm. I cannot say if this has been maintained, as the Seaman listens to the meanderings of the garrulous God with more patience than I have been able to muster.

In the war poems, Mr. Trench places himself above the battle. He might be leaning contemplatively over the rim of some remote planet, surveying the distracted earth through long glasses. His style is leisurely in the extreme. The *Battle of the Marne* clings to twenty-four pages with the dull persistence of a fossil. I see by the author's note: "This action was in truth a chain of five battles in a curved line. Those who know the ground will recognize in this poem the third battle." It is cheering to hear that "those who know the ground"—and have been able to carry away enough of their anatomy to preserve a critical consciousness will have a chance to enjoy the saving emotion of recognition. Mr. Trench is more entertaining when he points a reproving finger at "A Certain Nation":

But to you (whose name

Verse will not utter lest it darken verse)

Technically most of the poems are pleasantly conventional. The ancient "ta'en" is here working over time, and "haviour" performs menial service for rhythm. The cumulative effect of the long poems is like that of a prolonged and colorless piano solo, played by a school girl intent on "expression". Their best recommendation is that they are easily forgotten. Some of the short poems like, *Who Art Thou Starry Host?* and, *Epitaph On An Infant* have some freshness, but they are like little over-lain children among all those expansive sisters.

My reaction to volume one was something like this: Here is a man who should have helped to swell the scanty "great audience"—but he has become obsessed with the delusion that all this manna of beauty descending upon him is of himself. Art's beneficiary is returning her half-worn gifts.

But some of the poems in the second volume sound a newer and clearer note. And the poet's consciousness no longer throws back only thin reflections. The *Stanzas to Tolstoy In His Old Age* show a growing compactness of thought. Conversation on the Russian Front has a quick-fire movement; it is the only one of the war poems that reads as though it might have clamored playfully to be written. And there is some charm in this little song:

Mounting the hill I found it long

Until I met a merry song

That kissed mine eyes to blind me;

It mocked at me and turned and fled

But played on, fluttering overhead,

Till I forgot I went footsore

And the dusty road that rose before

Was the blue hill far behind me!

The book needs pruning; most of the poems might well be lopped off whole. Still, Mr. Trench is losing his reverence. His muse is no longer a mistress whose shallow sentimentalizings are received as sacred commands. Selection is practiced—and rejection. The poet listens, but no longer on his knees. The *Questioners* is the best poem in the col-



Cited for Merit—

THE OLD MADHOUSE by William De Morgan Author of "Somehow Good"

"One of the greatest mysteries of a man's disappearance in the whole range of fiction . . . likely to rank among the best of all the writer's books."—London Dispatch in New York Times.

Developing in true De Morgan fashion an incomprehensible disappearance in broad daylight on the one hand and on the other a tangled love affair, all with a wise and kindly humor. Ready September 4th. **\$1.90**

THE PROBLEM OF THE PACIFIC by C. Brunsdon Fletcher Author of "The New Pacific."

Shall any of the possessions held by Germany in the Pacific be restored to that Power? Will a beaten Germany be a converted Germany, as to just colonial administration? The discussion of Japan's part in this puzzle is of especial interest. **\$3.00**

THE CHINESE PUZZLE by Marian Bower and Leon M. Lion

The astounding announcement in a London newspaper of an "agreement" between England and China, which was supposed to be an impenetrable diplomatic secret, ruffles British financial circles and sets in motion a compelling mystery story in which an astute old Chinaman plays a fascinating part. A story that will hold the reader as in play form it held its London audiences. **\$1.60**

MAIN CURRENTS OF SPANISH LITERATURE by J. D. M. Ford of Harvard

Affords a survey of the literature of the land of Blasco Ibanez, Benavente, etc. Lucid discussion of the Epic and the Ballad of the Heroic Tradition, Cervantes and his work, the Drama from Lope de Vega to Calderon, with chapters on the Lyric, Poetry, and the Novel; on the enduring worth of Spanish-American literature. **\$2.00**

PROPOSED ROADS TO FREEDOM Socialism, Anarchism, Syndicalism by Bertrand Russell

A fair minded exposition of the three major social movements, full of discerning criticism and constructive suggestion. The Atlantic Monthly says: "No present-day book of social criticism is more in touch with the realities of life . . . characterized by admirable impartiality." **\$1.50**

SHORT STORIES OF THE NEW AMERICA Edited by Mary A. Laselle

The motive in this discerning collection of contemporary fiction is the desire to interpret the America of this age to young readers, through the best literature that has come out of the war. Aside from its consistently high literary quality, the volume is commendable for the patriotic note it sounds. **\$1.35**

¶ Romain Rolland's "Colas Breugnon, Burgundian," his first novel since "Jean-Christophe," will be ready early in September.

Publishers of "THE UNPARTIZAN REVIEW"

Henry Holt & Company

Nineteen West Forty-fourth Street, New York

lection. I should like to quote more than these two stanzas:

Threshold, familiar Threshold, may I not pass?

Not till thou tell me my name!

Stone of wonder; on thee were the wedding flowers
When I bore in to my hearth a silken-haired stranger—
Strange unto me was her heart, strange to her mine,
And soft and doubtful she trembled, like the blue eve . . .

Pass on, pass on!

III

Naked and sounding Stair, may I not pass?

Tell me my name!

Stair of meeting, where nightly I called the call
Of the exultant, the earth-engirdling, the nightingale,
And she from the stairhead, infinite-eyed and slow,
Came down in her gliding brightness into my soul . . .

Pass on, pass on!

Here is no transplanted blossom, already full-grown and faded, but a seed that has germinated into a serene and adequate beauty. In it the poet has achieved "the song more beautiful than silence."

L. R.

Emerson in French

Autobiographie D'Après Son "Journal Intime" Traduction, Introduction et Notes par Régis Michaud Professor a L'Université de Princeton (Etats-Unis). Librairie Armand Colin.

EMERSON in French! Why not? Poe found French form when Baudelaire and Mallarmé discovered in him a morbidity which fascinated their own decadent temperament; Whitman is already a force in French poetry, thanks to Sarrazin and Bazalgette, and Viélé-Griffin, and the catholic spirit of the *Mecure de France*. And now the French are to have Emerson in their own tongue and the most intimate Emerson which could be given them, the Emerson of the hearth, the neighborhood, the provincial aristocrat, the passionate individualist who for fifty years at the gateway of a new democracy kept his mind alert to the culture of old Europe and doubly alert to the possibility of awakening America. To reduce fifty years of journal writing, ten large volumes, to two small ones is a test in the manipulation of material. M. Michaud meets it well. He has the French sense of order and effect. Emerson is here a vivid personality—he speaks out his life as it were and his thought loses none of its scope in this syncopated arrangement. Indeed it gains, for so skilfully is its variousness adjusted that Emerson presents himself in a sequence of spiritual experience, and thus justifies calling these volumes an autobiography.

The translation, some of it, has the pleasure of a surprise. Emerson, so bold in imagination, a poet more than a philosopher, does not appeal to us in any other than in his own tongue. One apprehends a loss in reach and flight in a formal French rendering. His lyric delight in nature, his meditation in the open air, his love of solitude are, in this new form, like remembering Rousseau. There is no stopping to balance the original and the translated version. Emerson would like this.

"Dans la solitude des montagnes on éprouve instantanément une exaltation sensible, une conscience plus pleine de ses droits dans l'univers. Qui erre par les bois perçoit combien il était naturel à l'imagination païenne de découvrir des dieux dans la profondeur de chaque bosquet, dans chaque source. La nature n'apparaît point silencieuse mais impatiente de se traduire en musique. Chaque arbre,

chaque fleur, chaque pierre est douée de vie et d'expression. Comment se pourrait-il que le murmure du vent si expressif dans le feuillage—n'eût aucun sens. . . ."

There is especially in the young Emerson, an affinity with Pascal, who was as tight minded a Calvinist as any of Emerson's clerical ancestors. These *Pensées* supplement Pascal, they reach beyond him, for Emerson wrought from his Calvinism a simple attractive type of detachment. Pan and Apollo were not less welcome at Concord than Pascal himself, whose asceticism put out of his life so much which Emerson distilled into joy and power. The Plato letter written when Emerson was a mere youth, reads well, and the sincere, the intense moments of youth have their appeal in a language rich in confessions of every kind!

"Aujourd'hui un moment d'indolence a donné naissance en moi à des rêves, à des sentiments cherchant à s'épancher en vers. Je songeais à la fuite de mes ans, ans tous pareils et sans histoire, à la crise près dans l'avenir, l'espace d'un mois devant décider de la teinte obscure ou claire que ma vie assumera désormais. Passée ma triste enfance; ma jeunesse décline vers l'âge d'homme. Que sont pour moi l'allégresse sans contrainte, les cheveux d'or, les yeux rians de l'adolescence? Je fuis leur attrait. Une voix solennelle me commande la retraite."

Continuing this same entry one does not feel carelessness in the translation but a fault in the French language itself, at whose roundabout grammar Flaubert used to hurl profanity:

"As-tu découvert en toi un défaut de sympathie qui mette entre toi et les autres une barrière? Efforce-toi de revenir aux idées, aux sentiments qui te rapprochent le plus des hommes. Discipline ton orgueil; fonde ce qu'il y a de glacé dans ta bienveillance; nourris en ton âme, quelque part, une étincelle de pur, d'héroïque enthousiasme."

This reads less vividly than the original:

"If you have found any defect in your sympathies that puts a bar between you and others, go and study to find those views and feelings in which you come nearest to other men. Go and school your pride and thaw your icy benevolence, and nurse somewhere in your soul a spark of pure and heroic enthusiasm."

Emerson turned to his lamp and his tomes, keeping what was best in him of Pascal in his cell, and Montaigne in his tower, and something else besides—a plain man without any trick of singularity except the one of a life pointing always to the open road. M. Michaud has translated fully Emerson's thoughts upon Montaigne and Montaigne's influence in his life. It is in a bit like the following that the French, if possible, should have been less formal. Emerson's vigorous vernacular is never better than in such criticism as this:

"Ces rudes et vieux compagnons, (the rough and tumble old fellows) les Bacons, les Miltons, les Burkes ne subtilisent pas (do not wire-draw). C'est pourquoi j'aime Montaigne. Ce n'est pas un philosophe de salon, un efféminé, qui élabore des idées prises dans un cours du soir, un débat de jeunes gens. Il dit rondement ce qu'il a vu ou pensé, au cours de ses chevauchées ou des réceptions (?) de son château. Une indecence grossière et à demi sauvage dépare son livre, et suffirait évidemment pour qu'on l'ecarta (put out of doors). Mais la vigueur de ses sentiments, la générosité de ses jugements, sa franchise sans peur et sans compromis, voilà ce que j'accueille à bras ouverts (with both arms). Cela est fort et savoureux comme la fougère odorante."

Now for another surprise in this translation. The tang, verve, oral tone, that prose quality in Emerson which he himself aptly calls the steel spring, may be difficult to communicate to the French version: but surely not Emerson's

DONGAN HALL

Dongan Hills, Staten Island, New York

A New Boarding and Country Day School for Girls

300 feet elevation. 13 acres. 50 minutes from New York City

College Preparatory and General Courses. Art, Music, Domestic Economy, Manual Training, Athletics, Riding. Remarkably beautiful and healthful surroundings. A school which combines the development of ideals, practical training of permanent value, and a high standard of scholarship.

ADA S. BLAKE, Principal.

THE SCHOOL THAT STUDIES LIFE

The Training School for Community Workers. Reorganized on the Cooperative Plan

JOHN COLLIER, Director

In an eight months' course the School prepares students to meet the demand for trained workers in Communities, Industrial Welfare Organizations, Public Schools, Churches and Colleges. Also offers short courses for trained workers already in the field and for volunteers.

Address for full information

MISS A. A. FREEMAN

Room 1001, 70 Fifth Avenue

New York City

Sargent's Handbook of

AMERICAN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

A Guide Book for Parents

A Standard Annual of Reference. Describes critically and discriminately the Private Schools of all classifications.

Introductory Chapters review interesting developments of the year.

Our Educational Service Bureau will be glad to advise and write you ultimately about any school or class of schools.

Fifth edition, 1919, revised and enlarged, 768 pp., \$3. Circulars and sample pages on request.

PORTER E. SARGENT

14 Beacon Street

Boston, Mass.

The Bureau of Industrial Research

465 West 23rd Street, New York City

announces the publication of

AMERICAN COMPANY SHOP COMMITTEE PLANS

A digest of twenty plans for employees' representation through joint committees introduced by American companies. One Dollar.

Also

The Industrial Council Plan in Great Britain

Twenty-five cents.

How the Government Handled Its Labor Problems During the War

Twenty-five cents.

Whatever book you want*Wanamaker's*

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCHwill open October first for the study of current economic and governmental problems. The work will be conducted by a group of well-known writers and teachers, among whom are: *Graham Wallas of London, James Harvey Robinson, John Dewey, Thomas S. Adams, Harold J. Laski, Thorstein Veblen, Wesley Clair Mitchell, Dean Roscoe Pound, Moissaye Olgin, Charles A. Beard, and Members of the Bureau of Municipal Research, Robert Bruere and Members of the Bureau of Industrial Research.*

There will be late afternoon and evening lectures and conferences to permit the attendance of those engaged in regular professions. No academic degrees will be required, but the standard of postgraduate work will be maintained. There will be general lectures and discussion for larger groups and small conferences for those equipped for special research.

Courses will include lectures on: *Economic Factors in Civilization, The Development of the United States into a World Power, The Historic Background of the Great War, Modern Industrialism, Social Inheritance, Recent Tendencies in Political Thought, Problems of American Government, etc.*

Registration will begin September twenty-second. Announcement will be sent upon application to

THE NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

465-469 West Twenty-third Street

NEW YORK CITY

Wanted: 100,000 names
carefully selected

Recently our friends have sent us 25,000 names of people who ought to be readers of The New Republic.

Personal letters sent to these people have brought subscriptions from an unusually high percentage.

William Allen White started the whole thing by sending us more than 200 names, with a letter in which he said: "If I were a rich man, I certainly would spend a thousand dollars introducing The New Republic."

One subscriber after another followed his example.

We can make good use of 100,000 names.

You must know many potential New Republic readers. Will you contribute your share of the 100,000 by sending us, say, 50?

As an acknowledgment, inadequate perhaps—of your interest—

we will send you, free

any one of the books from The Modern Library listed on the inside back cover of the August 6th issue. In sending your list of 50 names and addresses, give the name of the book you want.

THE NEW REPUBLIC, 421 West 21st St., N. Y. City

gravity and rhythm. The translator disregards too much Emerson's subtle blending of idea and form. It is permissible to translate freely when he ranges among images common to all poetry; but the rhythm of the single sentence such as—Against Fate, Thought—is marred in its French rendering by a change in word order, and in punctuation. These rhythmic sentences brighten the journals like jewels and it is a pity to take away their luster in a language whose rhythmic prose is one of the triumphs of literature. There is no gain in ignoring the form of—The longest life is but a morning; but where is the Day? or—The beauty of the landscape is in proportion to the quantity of light: from tragic to celestial. Yet M. Michaud invents a punctuation of his own and spoils the *Pensées*. He does this so much that it is a serious question whether he has a trained sense of prose. No art is more exacting, no other has such range of shade and subtlety. Because this is true the New Poetry exists. Emerson is an initial force in it, and never so forceful as in his journals. The *Essays* were living; the journals, his life. M. Michaud should revise this portion of his work if he is to be just, not to Emerson and to English only but to himself and to French. Otherwise he casts doubt on Heine's dictum that all thought when translated into French is exactly as it should be.

A generous portion of this new Emerson is given to his visits to France, to his comments upon French literature. These translate well and are, at this time, a genuine *entente littéraire*. M. Michaud might have added Emerson's wise and just words about the novel as well as his wise and just view of George Sand. Emerson had little of the fictional method himself. This is where he and the French part company—in presenting detail and portraiture. The seer and philosopher in him neutralize the raconteur. What manner of man Thoreau was, how Margaret Fuller looked in her discursive moments, the personality of Channing and the impersonality of Hawthorne—how one wishes for a close impression of this group. Emerson gives us none and American biography is the poorer for this reticence, a reticence which whatever his affinity with the French is in him an overmastering English tradition. Our literature is poor in biography, in memoir, poor in the element of the social and the sociable, which in French from Saint-Simon to des Goncourt is a mine of wealth, for historian and novelist.

ELLEN FITZGERALD.

Iron

The Iron Hunter, by Chase S. Osborn, New York: The Macmillan Co.

THE nineteenth century education that Henry Adams missed Chase Osborn achieved by a saturation in the lore of iron as deep as Adams's in the eighteenth century historians, who, he laments, filled the shelves of his father's library in Boston. At the age when Adams was imbibing the Civil law via a thirteenth century lecture system at Berlin, Chase Osborn had already "been underground in nearly every mine and exploration in the Lake Superior ranges;" a few years later, while Adams, at the same age, was trying to sell his services as a journalist for four dollars a day, Osborn was offered five hundred a month and expenses by a Milwaukee and Chicago syndicate to supervise iron examinations in the Echo Lake regions of Canada. It was the syndicate's intention that Mr. Osborn should find iron whether there was any or not: "such was the speculative excitement that a good story could have been capitalized

to big advantage. Next year they sent in another person who supplied the desired report, upon which more than a quarter of a million dollars were expended and lost."

When Mr. Osborn writes about other things he is capable of bizarre quaintnesses, he stumbles and bruises his thought in jagged crevasses of words. But when he writes of iron he is crystalline, eloquent, comprehensible, even when the scientific jargon he lavishes is not. He fingers the strange words—titanium, hematite, taconite, siderite, itabirite, limenite, martite, much like a lapidary or a poet fond of strange gems. Iron is his sesame to all education, all knowledge. The metabolism and katabolism of iron enzymes, "iron ore bugs" he calls them, epitomize for him the universal mystery; the metal focusses the wonder of microscopic life as it is the focus for his curiosity and wonder at all other life. The search for iron is the key to his other searches and other discoveries: "I decided to visit all the places in the world, if possible, where iron ore is produced in commercial quantities. A big undertaking. Naturally that involved a study of other lands, their resources and geology. Even that was not enough so I added the study of government and particularly the methods of Colonial Government adopted by those powers chiefly engaged in colonizing the world." So the contemplation of the multifarious usefulness of iron in the modern world, its capacity for diversion to infinite good, fires him with the sense of the dignity and importance of the men in the mines, even the lowliest, even the Negro working in Africa, whom he invites to join a mighty fellowship of labor. These men are more important than the growers of wheat because there are substitutes for wheat; therefore, "those who are associated with its production (iron) should know of the dignity of their calling; should realize it and then their hearts and souls would fill their big bodies until brawn and spirit are one. . . ." Comes another illumination: "From this realization it is only a step further to the practical conviction that they are entitled to even more consideration; to continuous employment (what kind of an army would it be that did not keep its soldiers constantly?) to a minimum wage, to old age insurance and pension, to adequate compensation for injury and death resulting from the risks of their work, to sanitary housing and moral environments."

Here is education, moral education as well, by the inductive method; you can watch it grow. Iron is the spring-board from which the Iron Hunter launches into history, economics, philosophy, science, modern sociology, and the result is surprising for its resilience. One might imagine this sort of education, however much a Henry Adams might desire it as offering salvation from anachronism, could not be gained save at the sacrifice of objectivity. The extraordinary thing about Chase Osborn's career and this remarkable record of it, is that such loss is not involved. In his judgments of his own successes and the greater successes of his friends, there is no lack of detachment. Reporting an all-night talk with Sir Donald Mann, the Canadian railroad man, he says: "He told me quite fully the remarkable story of his life—his interesting association with McKenzie, their very modern financiering and much of the business minutiae, the mastery of which is by some standards of judging supposed to make men great." Or take this passage describing the tone of politics in Detroit while he was part of the Pingree administration: "There were more men than mules, and they were easier to get; the supply was unending. Social reformers were anarchists. A disciple of Karl Marx and Rudolph Engels was crazy. Any one who agreed with Henry George was a moron. Herr Most and Emma Goldman should be hung." An ex-governor, he

speaks of governors much as Henry Adams speaks of presidents and senators—except for the colloquialism: "Any old dub may be a governor or a United States senator and several have been, but generally the regents of the University of Michigan have been high-grade, well-equipped men."

It was while Mr. Osborn was Regent of the University of Michigan that Charles Evans Hughes, David Jayne Hill and Woodrow Wilson were mentioned as possible successors to the late President of the University, James B. Angell. Mr. Osborn's account of his interview with Mr. Hill is in his breeziest manner: "Mr. Hill looked like ideal timber. I went to Berlin to look him over. It is proper, I think, to state that I paid my own expenses. Accuracy, at the expense of elegance, requires me to record that I reported to the Board of Regents that Mr. Hill had taken on too much weight of all kinds." Despite the attraction of Mr. Wilson's "exterior luminescence" it was decided, when "his gratuitous quarrel with Grover Cleveland was analyzed . . . that Dr. Wilson was tactless" and "that he was not good enough to be President of the University of Michigan." Mr. Osborn occasionally chooses lesser heroes for worship, like the late General Alger, but his judgments of men are rarely without a pungent directness.

As Governor of Michigan Mr. Osborn stood for reform. He got a Workmen's Compensation bill passed, administered under a plan copied by many other states. Six years before suffrage was passed in Michigan he fought for a Women's Suffrage bill, but was defeated by the liquor tong. He was the consistent foe of the Vote Swappers' League, the local Tammany. In the recital of these battles there is a justifiable pride, the more gratifying in a book from which the complacency of the self-made man is refreshingly absent. It is perhaps natural that a man who overcame splendidly tremendous difficulties should still believe in a crude Darwinism: the fittest surviving finely in a world where the opportunities are as manifold as ever. But such a limitation is less worthy of remark than that, writing in December, 1918, Mr. Osborn retains balance sufficiently to ask whether "it is unkind or unfair to recall that within the brief cycle of a century Great Britain, Russia, France and Italy, not to forget our part too, have seized nearly two-thirds of the surface of the earth," Congo outrages, Sepoys loaded into cannons and shot out for "schrecklichkeit" by Britains, American ministrants teaching Moros righteousness by means of the water-cure? Recollection of this sort in the moment of victory is remarkable in any case; in *The Iron Hunter* it is also characteristic. S. N. B.

Contributors

to this issue

ALFRED B. KUTTNER has been engaged in journalism since he graduated from Harvard in 1908. He has translated several of Freud's books and is at present engaged in psycho-analytic research.

G. B. NOBLE is First Lieutenant of the 168th Infantry. He was wounded in operations around Chateau-Thierry and decorated with the D. S. O. Later he was attached to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace, where he was responsible for summaries and analyses of the French press.

H. N. BRAILSFORD is an English publicist and the author of several books on international affairs.

S. N. BEHRMAN is a Harvard graduate who has written several short stories.

Six New Books—One for Every Taste

IRELAND'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

By George Creel

Frank P. Walsh says: "Every American with Irish blood in his veins should read George Creel's book. All Americans who want the truth about Ireland should read the book. It is written as only George Creel can write when he writes from his heart. No more unanswerable argument against English rule in Ireland was ever made; no clearer, finer presentation of the Irish cause was ever framed. The book is worth an army to Ireland."

Illustrated. \$2.00

PERCOLATOR PAPERS

By Ellwood Hendrick

In an original style and from a thoroughly modern viewpoint, Mr. Hendrick treats of things vital to life here and now; handling these themes in a manner to produce thought and discussion. There is about his work the scientist's exactness, plus the whimsical turn of a man with a ripe and imaginative mind.

\$1.75

OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NEWSPAPER BUSINESS

By James Melvin Lee

Mr. Lee, who is the Director of the Department of Journalism at New York University, here tells of the chances held out to young men who wish to take up newspaper work. He deals with every phase of the profession of Journalism showing the opportunities of Metropolitan Dailies as well as the small city Daily and country paper.

\$1.00

SYLVIA AND MICHAEL

By Compton Mackenzie

Sylvia Scarlett, already known to Mr. Mackenzie's readers, turns up in Russia a vagabond cabaret singer, having left behind her the safety and success she had found in England. Through Russia, Rumania and Serbia, Sylvia makes her way, having one adventure after another and learning much about life as she faces it under the heightened stress of war. An unusual romance.

\$1.75

GOING WEST

By Basil King

The story of a love that extended beyond death, and bridged the gulf with a message from the man who died fighting in France to his wife who waited at home. Readers of Mr. King's "Abraham's Bosom" will find in this an even finer piece of literary work, and a more conclusive proof that, as Maeterlinck said, "There are no dead."

Paper boards, 60 cents

THE STORY HISTORY OF FRANCE

By John Bonner

Mr. Bonner tells the story of France from the earliest days down to the signing of the armistice—tells it with an emphasis on the human interest that makes of the usual dry chronicle of events a living narrative with the fascination of well-written fiction. Several hundred illustrations.

\$1.75

HARPER & BROTHERS, Established 1817
NEW YORK

**READY NOW
ORDER TODAY**



*The most informative and authoritative account of
Russia, how its people live and are governed
under the Soviet Republic:*

RUSSIA IN 1919

by

ARTHUR RANSOME

This book is needed

So much misinformation has been ladled out that the truth about Russia has become so rare as to be sensational. *New Republic* readers know Mr. Ransome to be a trustworthy expert on Russian matters. His experience and integrity distinguish him from the personally-conducted, hand-picked reporters who "discovered" Russia as tourists used to discover Paris.

Its valuable contents

HERE are personal interviews with Lenin and the heads of important departments of the government; accounts of meetings of Soviets and the Moscow Executive Committee; figures concerning schools, libraries, etc.; prices of food and commodities; facts about the conversion of private enterprises to communal control; agriculture, transport, the army, police, housing, trade unions, to say nothing of observations on the personal and human aspects of the contemporary Russian scene.

Its lighter features

THERE are pen-pictures of the leaders, reports of what the people read, a list of plays and operas given in a single fortnight in Moscow, portrayals of the simple conditions that have become inevitable, of the levelling of caste, of the permission required to buy a suit of clothes (if the purchaser possesses the fortune that such an investment demands), of the government manoeuvres to circumvent food profiteers, and a mass of other information.

Its value to you

THIS is the book that honest inquirers are waiting for; it is unprejudiced; it is sound; it is entertaining. It is the book with which to refute the ignorant and the malicious. (Price \$1.50; postpaid, \$1.60.)

B. W. Huebsch PUBLISHER, 32 WEST 58TH STREET **New York**



PEOPLE'S HIGH SCHOOL

7 EAST 15th STREET

Under Direction of Rand School

A school to introduce boys and girls to the problems and thoughts of their own time, according to modern methods.

A school without dogma for opening the eyes and the minds of youth.

A school to train for freedom for initiative and for responsibility.

Ask for Particulars.

FIFTY VOLUNTEERS WANTED

to enlist as candidates for the

CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

in a campaign for a Reconstructed Church and Nation in the spirit which won the victory at Chateau Thierry and St. Mihiel. Such volunteers are needed at once in the liberal pulpits of America, and may be trained for efficient service at the

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Meadville, Pa.

Autumn Quarter begins Sept. 24. Summer Quarter (at Chicago) begins June 16. Summer sessions at the expense of the School at the University of Chicago. Liberal scholarship aid. Traveling fellowships providing for further study at foreign universities available at graduation.

Apply to

Rev. F. C. Southworth, D.D., LL.D.
President

What George Creel Found in Ireland



Never was there a story so dramatic — so heroic — as the tale of Ireland's struggle for home rule. Never has it been told so brilliantly as in this remarkable book.

IRELAND'S FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

by **George Creel**

Frank P. Walsh says:

"Every American with Irish blood in his veins should read George Creel's book. All Americans who want the truth about Ireland should read the book. It is written as only George Creel can write when he writes from his heart. No more unanswerable argument against English rule in Ireland was ever made; no clearer, finer presentation of the Irish cause was ever framed. The book is worth an army to Ireland."

No open-minded American should miss this important book. Get it today from your bookseller. Illustrated, \$2.00.

HARPER & BROTHERS Established 1817
NEW YORK

"Written with Soul"

Futurist Stories

By **MARGERY
VERNER REED**
of Denver

Is a book that will open
new vistas of style to
writers and students of
literature.

Order your copy today

Mitchell Kennerley, Publisher
New York



NATIONAL NONPARTISAN LEAGUE

A bundle of literature on the League and its achievements. Price 50 cents. EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT, NONPARTISAN LEAGUE, St. Paul, Minn.